

František Kolar

THE EXPORT OF COUNTER- REVOLUTION: PAST AND PRESENT



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

František Kolar

THE EXPORT OF COUNTER- REVOLUTION: PAST AND PRESENT



*Progress Publishers
Moscow*

Translated from the Russian by *Ludmila Lezhneva*
Designed by *Boris Kazakov*

Франтишек Колар

ЭКСПОРТ КОНТРРЕВОЛЮЦИИ:
ИСТОРИЯ И СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ
На английском языке

© Перевод на русский язык, послесловие, дополнения — издательство «Прогресс», 1983

English translation © Progress Publishers 1986

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

К $\frac{0800000000-302}{014(01)-86}$ 42—86

CONTENTS

Author's Note	5
A Journey into the Past	11
In the Times of the Hussites	13
American Colonists and the War of Independence (1775-1783)	18
The Unholy Coalition	21
The Counter-Revolution of 1848	27
The Conspiracy Against the Paris Commune	28
Mexico: Robbery in Broad Daylight	32
Latin America: One Invasion After Another	33
Recent History	36
Invaders Join Forces	36
Plotting Against Soviet Hungary	43
Western Countries Betray the Spanish Republic	48
Hand-in-hand with Fascism	50
Behind the Back of Their Soviet Ally	55
Under the Guise of "Aid"	62
Czechoslovakia, 1948: Reactionary Coup Fails	66
The UN Flag as a Cover	73
"Day X" for the German Democratic Republic	79
Hungarian Putsch	82
"Dirty" Vietnam War	87
Massacres in Indonesia	91
Abortive Attempt to Take Revenge	95
Today's Reality	100
Hatred of the Saur Revolution	100
The West Looks for a "Weak Link"	104
Israel, a Base of Aggression	113

Fighting for a Colony	122
International Terrorism, Real and Imagined	128
Economic Subversion	135
Beware of Poisoned Radiowaves	144
The Soviet Union: Working for Peace and Social Progress	153
Following the Principles of Proletarian In- ternationalism	153
The Liberation Mission of the Soviet Union	155
Imperialist Conspiracies	158
Two Approaches to the German Problem .	161
The Broken Chains of the Colonialism . .	163
Selfless Aid	165
Community of Fraternal Nations	167
Guardian of Peace and Socialism	170
People, Be Vigilant! (Conclusion)	173
Afterword	180

Author's Note

The reader certainly heard of the frenzied hullo-labaloo raised by the imperialist mass media in connection with the alleged Soviet "interference" in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan, Poland, Angola and El Salvador.

Anyone reviewing the history of imperialism, especially American imperialism, would have only smiled ironically at these clumsy attacks, had they not led to accusations so grave or threats and sabre-rattling so violent. After all, the history of imperialism is a chain of open acts of intervention and interference of every kind into other countries' internal affairs, predatory wars and undisguised aggression with the subsequent occupation of other people's territories and the establishment of murderous dictatorships.

The Soviet Union and its socialist allies have a different history and never engaged in unjust, predatory wars of aggression. Loyal to Lenin's behests, the Soviet Union together with the other members of the socialist community has always helped and continues helping the exploited and oppressed nations in their struggle for freedom, national independence and social justice.

Today we are witnessing imperialism's militarism and aggressiveness growing with each passing year. This tendency is especially manifest in the

United States, whose home and foreign policies are under the undivided sway of the military-industrial complex, an alliance of the top brass, war-oriented industry and science subservient to them. General David Shoup, who at one time commanded the US Marines notorious for their participation in all sorts of invasions and acts of aggression, once made a characteristic confession. He said that the Americans had become a nation of aggressors and militarists, as they had gradually got used to American expansionism and the cult of weapons and violence inseparable from wars. The General stretched it too far, referring to the nation as a whole, but there is a grain of truth in what he said.

After the Second World War American foreign policy was shaped by different doctrines that were named after the US Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson, Nixon and Carter. All of them shared the desire to rule the world and hatred for Communism and they all eventually suffered a fiasco: today's alignment of forces in the world is a far cry from that of the times when Clark and similar adventurers decimated Indians in the boundless expanses of the North American prairies, just like they decimated the herds of peaceful buffaloes.

The Reagan Administration has failed to offer anything fundamentally different from the doctrine of the preceding American president, Jimmy Carter. The latter, with his ambitions of a small peanut trader compounded by the piety of a Baptist preacher and the ignorance of a provincial

politician, expounded his programme on January 29, 1980, in his State of the Union Message to the Congress. He spoke about American claims to the "leading role in the world" and arrogantly declared some regions of the globe to be spheres of "vital American interests". Should these interests be threatened, the US would defend them by any means, including military, and hence the American Administration is to further expand its military budget in the future. Wherever the American Administration find the "vital American interests" threatened, the rapid deployment force will be brought into play. Carter tried to dovetail this stale belligerent doctrine, used repeatedly in the past, with the so-called Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

The Reagan Administration worked out its own comprehensive aggressive military doctrine, which had been thought out in great detail. This is only natural since the Vice-President in the present Administration is George Bush, the long-time CIA chief in the past, and Reagan's first Secretary of State was General Alexander Haig, who was largely responsible for the dirty war in Vietnam. It was Haig who made the notorious statement that "there are things more important than peace".

Ronald Reagan unambiguously formulated the essence of his military programme—to finance armaments to such an extent as to ensure unquestioned American military superiority throughout the globe. Hence the new Administration's foreign policy task—to establish absolute domination, which is to lead to undivided American rule in the world.

Reagan is by no means original in this respect: quite a few of his predecessors also nurtured hopes for Pax Americana, by attaining superiority above all over the Soviet Union. Ever since the American B-29 bomber dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, world imperialism spearheaded by the American strategists has been spell-bound by an illusion of its military and diplomatic superiority, wagering on nuclear weapons as a means to bridle all the anti-imperialist revolutionary movements.

Washington is still haunted by these illusions even though it has lost the atomic monopoly. Conversely, this seems to have spurred the militarists to look for other ways of attaining superiority. In his book *The Day Before Doomsday* the American journalist Sidney Lens draws on facts of doubtless veracity to prove that the US with its military-industrial complex is indeed responsible for the current arms race. He writes, "Thus, from the very beginning, fixation on the Bomb as the cornerstone of American power was a delusion Yet, like compulsive gamblers, the American power elites fed their delusion by putting more chips in their pot.

"Instead of a long look into the consequences of their miscalculation, they continued to ride the tide of every technological breakthrough—from the fission bomb to the fusion bomb, the solid fuel missile, the ABM, the MIRV—with the single hope that one of them would *guarantee* victory."¹

¹ Sidney Lens, *The Day Before Doomsday. An Anatomy of the Nuclear Arms Race*, Doubleday and Company, Inc., New York, 1977, p. 39.

Monopolies involved in military production annually spend millions of dollars to maintain and whip up the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet campaign intended to breed fear of the Soviet Union and the "Communist menace". This psychological warfare advertised under Reagan as a "crusade" against socialism was meant to justify the arms race in the eyes of the public.

In the past few years, propaganda campaigns whipped up in the West paid special attention to "struggle against international terrorism", by which the imperialists mean any revolutionary, national liberation movement in the world. Sidney Lens, already quoted earlier, said that that propaganda hullabaloo in fact accompanied "a steady propulsion towards Doomsday, on the one hand, and—the final irony—towards a police state, which obliterates democracy and freedom, on the other".¹

Ronald Reagan and Caspar Weinberger are obsessed with the idea of a third world war, which is the main postulate of their military doctrine. Should this war begin, it would certainly engulf the whole of our planet and perhaps also space surrounding it. The imperialist politicians and mass media recklessly advertise and praise the new means of mass annihilation—chemical and bacteriological weapons, lasers, neutron bombs, and so on—on which ever more money is being spent.

Reagan has publicly disavowed certain treaties and agreements on limiting the arms race signed

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

by the US in the 1970s. This means that the current American Administration goads the world to take direct or indirect part in a new round of the arms race. The policy is dangerous: it can lead to war and creates a new international situation, which cannot leave the socialist countries indifferent.

A JOURNEY INTO THE PAST

Historical experience shows that in one form or another revolutions are always accompanied by counter-revolutions, a fact noted by Karl Marx. The development of the revolutionary process cannot but be accompanied by counter-revolution in the sense that the ruling classes have never voluntarily relinquished power and always organised resistance to the new social order. That is to say, the counter-revolution is in fact the response of the reactionary classes to social revolution. The outgoing classes seek to retain or at least revamp the old social system, with the internal reactionary forces usually supported by all available means from abroad. Nowadays, these means include sweeping campaigns of lies and slander in the press, on the radio and TV, psychological warfare, subversion and sabotage, resort to subversive elements and economic blockade, and finally, armed invasion, all of which constitute the export of counter-revolution.

In the course of nearly 500 years of recent history—from the Hussite Wars on the territory of modern Czechoslovakia, the War of Independence in North America against the British colonialists

in the 18th century, the French Revolution of 1789, the October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia, and up to the present-day revolutionary movements in Cuba, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and so on—counter-revolution acquired most diverse forms and resorted to ever more sophisticated methods of subversion, such as sabotage, coups, plots, and armed attacks, and even civil war. Counter-revolution should not be underestimated: defending what is old and outdated, it can be patient, persistent, and amazingly resourceful, adjusting itself to the most complicated circumstances, taking into account mistakes and learning from experience. For instance, given the present-day alignment of forces in the world, counter-revolution cannot hope for success in an open confrontation with things new and progressive, and therefore engages in ideological war, exploiting religious prejudices and nationalistic sentiments or pushing the workers' parties towards revisionism and social-democratic degeneration.

Western theoreticians of anti-communism include all sorts of Sovietologists, Kremlinologists and a sizable group of "sociologists of revolution", who devise the models and doctrines of counter-revolution. Two of them—Chicago "researchers" Nathan Leites and Charles Wolf—wrote a book, *Rebellion and Authority*, in which they counsel reactionary governments on how to resist popular revolutions. They present as an example for emulation the US general in charge of the troops that suppressed an armed rebellion in the Philippines in 1901, who "ordered the area to be transformed

into what later was to be called a 'free-kill zone'.¹ They also recommend first of all to do away with the leaders of the rebels, which proves to be far more effective than the annihilation of several rebellious detachments. These "theories" are embodied in the practice of present-day counter-revolution and sometimes come to light in the reports of the American press, when for one reason or another it discloses secret activities of the CIA. This subversive terrorist organisation resorts precisely to the methods recommended by the aforementioned theorists, such as the establishment of an intelligence network, physical elimination of revolutionaries and patriots, blunt and brutal violence, and scorched-earth tactics.

IN THE TIMES OF THE HUSSITES

Fifteenth-century Bohemia saw the emergence of the Hussite national movement, a major anti-feudal movement in Europe; the Czech people staunchly fought for a long time for their social and national liberation. The movement was of immense importance to the destinies of the Czech people and to the development of their national self-awareness and entered an illustrious page into the annals of human history. In the Dark Ages the Czechs were the first among the European pe-

¹ N. Leites and C. Wolf, Jr., *Rebellion and Authority. An Analytic Essay on Insurgent Conflict*, The RAND Corporation, Markham Publishing Company, Chicago, 1970, p. 96.

oples to come out against the domination by the Roman Catholic Church.

Zdenek Nejedly, a well-known Czechoslovak scholar, statesman and public figure, wrote the following: "The Hussite Wars were the pinnacle of Czech history... because during that period the Czechs spearheaded European progress, outpacing other nations. They were the first to proudly and courageously raise the banner of a new freedom—social, political and spiritual, and it was only later on that other nations launched similar struggle."

Small wonder that the popular Hussite movement was not to the liking of the ruling nobles of the period, the rich feudal lords possessing enormous land estates, the German upper classes in town, and the Catholic Church which was the biggest feudal lord of them all. The common people were indignant at the shameless and illegal seizure of land, real estate, and every other property by the Catholic Church. Bohemia's riches attracted all sorts of oppressors in those years. Cathedrals and monasteries stored huge reserves of gold and silver, and a sizable portion of the riches was taken abroad to the papal treasury. To gain more profit, the church did not hesitate to sell indulgence on a large scale, guided by the principle, the graver the sin, the higher the price.

It was poor clergymen who often voiced popular discontent and protest against corruption among the higher clergy. Especially prominent among them was Jan Hus, a preacher at the Bethlehem Chapel in Prague and rector of the (Char-

les) University of Prague, who passionately exposed abuses and moral degradation among the Catholic clergy, and sharply condemned the selling of indulgence and called for a radical reform of the Catholic Church. He openly stood for an end to the absolute rule by the Catholic Church and the German upper classes in towns.

The clergy put him on trial, but he would not renounce his ideas and continued spreading the word of truth; for that he was burnt on the sentence of the Council of Constance. The rulers of the period believed that not only Hus himself but the entire Bohemian people were heretics, steeped in "deadly" sins. Indeed,

- the Hussites came out against the Catholic Church, which owned vast landed estates, 100 years before any other nation did the same;

- the Czechs freed themselves from the ideological influence of the Catholic Church;

- the formerly unquestioned authority of the papacy was radically undermined;

- the first impetus was given to the split in the Catholic Church, which culminated in the sixteenth century Reformation, the separation of the Protestant churches from the Roman Catholic Church;

- the progressive and radical ideas propagated by the Hussites proceeded from the need to abolish the rule of the church and the big landlords and the entire feudal socio-economic system;

- the Hussites rose against the rich German upper classes in town and their German rulers, expelling them eventually from Bohemia.

According to the clerics, those "sins" and "crimes" of the common people who defied the rich and powerful oppressors had to be extirpated through the export of counter-revolution. In medieval religious terminology, it was called "crusades", and proclaimed by the Pope on the initiative of German Emperor Sigismund I, who had for years unsuccessfully aspired to the Bohemian throne after the death of his brother, King Wenceslas IV of Bohemia. Several crusades were launched against the Hussites but none of them was a success. The Hussite army was always victorious, whereas the crusaders were routed more than once.

In April 1420, the 100,000-strong army of the crusaders was defeated in the battle at the Vítkov Mount, which is now crowned with the monument to Jan Zižka¹, who seems to be watching how his behests are being translated into life.

In November 1420, the Hussites won another victory over Sigismund's troops in the battle outside Prague and seized Vysehrad, the Prague Castle.

The second crusade took place in 1422 and also suffered a fiasco. In 1426, after Jan Zižka's death, the Hussites defeated the crusaders and Saxon feudal lords in the battle at Ustí-over-Elbe.

In subsequent years the crusaders would invariably take to their heels upon hearing the solemn war hymn of the Hussites "Who Are You, God's Warriors?"

¹ Jan Zižka (circa 1360-1424) is the Czech national hero and military leader.—*Ed.*

The last, fifth crusade against Bohemia ended in 1431 with the battle at Domažlice, where a huge army of crusaders was defeated by the Taborites under the command of the brilliant military leader, Procop the Great.

The feudal Catholic reactionaries, however, learned from the experience of those defeats, and started looking for round-about ways, conducting negotiations, plotting, and pitting Hussites against each other and, unfortunately, scored success. United, the enemies emerged victorious in the battle at Lipany in 1434. "The Hussite revolution failed to hold out," Zdenek Nejedly wrote, "not so much because the enemy was strong as because of its own mistakes."

Counter-revolution has always preferred to act on the sly, using secret methods, inveigling and bribing people, pushing them to betrayal . . . Something similar happened in Poland, against which—who would have thought?!—just like 500 years ago, the papacy, whose practices are so well known since the times of the Hussite Wars, proclaimed another crusade, naturally, a modern one, i.e., anti-communist, and, to be sure, at a more rational, highly "civilised" and "intellectual" level.

"Where are the enemy swords?" Jan Hus wrote to the Polish king in 1410 after the battle at Grünwald. "Those who had sought to intimidate the poor people have been crushed by the truth. Malice and pride rose threateningly together and lost many thousands, humiliated in vain. Where are the swords, the horses in caparisons and armour

on which so much hopes have been pinned? Where is the wealth of gold or treasures? Everything was lost. The haughty would not believe that the poor, formerly submissive, would win."

The words sound relevant today and some people across the Atlantic would do good to heed this warning . . .

As time goes by these words may be understood differently but their essence is unchanging. Jan Hus' wisdom goes beyond ages and doesn't fail to impress us today. A people knowing what it wants and fighting to attain justice is not to be deluded for long and is therefore invincible.

AMERICAN COLONISTS AND THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE (1775-1783)

Ironically enough, counter-revolutionary methods and practices—then quite imperfect as yet—were first tried and tested on America itself.

This happened more than 200 years ago when a democratic liberation movement sprang up in the North American colony of Britain. It grew into the revolutionary war, which Lenin called "the war the American people waged against the British robbers, who oppressed America and held her in colonial slavery . . ." ¹ For seven long years the British Crown ruthlessly sought to quell thirteen colonies that had rebelled and united in their

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Letter to American Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 62.

struggle. The British mercenaries led by experienced generals seized Philadelphia and made George Washington's revolutionary army, lacking weapons, clothes and often boots as well, retreat to boundless and deserted prairies. However, it was precisely those untrained but patriotically-minded troops rather than the British Royal Army who eventually emerged victorious. The reason is univocal—the former were inspired by the lofty goal they fought for, while King George III lost, despite his 30,000-strong army of mercenaries specially recruited to fight in America on agreement with German barons from whom those thugs were "bought". (That was how counter-revolution was exported to America in the late 18th century.)

America, once a country whose revolutionary armies won freedom and independence in the struggle against armed counter-revolution brought from abroad, is today a patent policeman of the world pursuing frankly expansionist aims.

American history can hardly be pictured as the evolution of progressive democratic traditions and movements characteristic of the early stages of that country's development. The road it has traversed is a succession of shameless acts of interference in the internal affairs of other states, territorial expansion, armed invasions, psychological and cold wars, and acts of unprovoked aggression against peoples resisting the export of counter-revolution. Every time the United States violated the basic principles of international law it resorted to hypocritical and cynical arguments of the

“vital interests” of the country or “concern for the protection of the life of American citizens and their property”. In 1925, Curtis Dwight Wilbur, US Secretary of the Navy, said, for example, that it was enough for an American child to shed a single tear somewhere in China, and America would start an armed invasion or interfere in the internal affairs of this country.

Such sentimental or, to be more precise, hypocritical pronouncements, can perhaps impress the ladies from philanthropic chauvinist organisations of the type of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The real state of affairs is somewhat different, however. Any appeal to lofty human values is in fact intended to camouflage the misanthropic essence and goals of American foreign policy and to disguise the barbarous methods used to attain those goals. In reality American foreign policy is a means of economic subjugation of weaker partners and turning them into a sphere of active penetration by American capital. The so-called cooperation proves to be nothing but a preliminary stage of economic expansion and invariably precedes open neocolonialism. According to Claude Julien, a French economist studying the problems of imperialism, it was the United States of America which “invented” this “new method”.

Speaking about American imperialism enslaving weaker nations, let me recall the “experience” accumulated by the US on its own territory. Hardly had a year passed since the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed in 1776, when General Clark’s army started eliminating Indian tribes

living in the north-eastern regions of the country. Several years of ruthless atrocities passed and in 1789 General Clark could by right boast that he had "cleared" a vast territory to be colonised. For more than a century "pale-faced" Americans engaged in that "civilised" campaign of exterminating the native population of the continent under the motto: "The only good Indian is a dead Indian." The Indian question was finally "solved" in 1925 by driving the few surviving Indian tribes into reservations. Out of 600 tribes less than 200 survived, some of them numbering not more than a thousand or even several hundreds of people. When destroying Indians, American troops resorted to a wide range of different methods—powder and lead were widely used, bison were hunted to make Indians starve to death, and the captured aborigines were "kindly" given blankets infected with cholera.

Already in those years Americans were indeed inventive . . .

THE UNHOLY COALITION

It is well known that the reactionary powers of the world joined forces to crush the French Revolution. The Revolution had great response in European countries: its ideals, like an irrepressible storm, swept away old notions, and disturbed the minds; the reigning monarchs were scared to death and their courts panic-stricken. French émigrés spread throughout Europe, hatching reaction-

ary plots and consolidating the counter-revolutionary forces.

Edmund Burke, a British publicist and politician, published in November 1790 his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, in which he vehemently attacked the reforms carried out. He denounced the revolution primarily for having abolished the aristocratic estates, and hence class hierarchy, which were allegedly preordained by God's will. His pamphlets had an immense vogue among the counter-revolutionaries, who ecstatically greeted them in Britain and other European countries. Pope Pius VI, who solemnly anathemised the Revolution of 1789, also blessed the book. Empress Catherine II of Russia gladly supported the idea of a crusade against the revolution, believing that the defence of the French king was the cause all the rulers had to support and that the "annihilation of the French anarchy" would be rewarded with eternal glory.

Comte d'Artois, (later Charles X) who had fled abroad, became one of the main leaders of the counter-revolutionary emigration. He settled in Turin and, among other things, demanded that Madrid should come out against the French Revolution, as a result of which Spanish troops were stationed along the Pyrenees to "block the French plague". Already in 1790 first armed detachments ready to strike against the revolution began to be formed in Coblenz on the Rhine, which gave shelter to the feudal monarchic counter-revolutionary émigrés. Ever since that time the word "Coblenz" has been synonymous to national treason.

In 1791, Emperor Leopold II of Austria and King Friedrich Wilhelm II of Prussia had a meeting in the Castle of Pillnitz (Saxony), where they signed the Declaration of Pillnitz on the joint struggle to restore the absolute monarchy of Louis XVI. Next Austria and Prussia concluded a treaty, which laid the foundation of a coalition of European feudal sovereigns against the French bourgeois revolution. The alliance was joined by King Victor Amadeus III of Sardinia, who was subsequently defeated by Bonapart. Another sworn enemy of the French Revolution, King Gustavus III of Sweden, started preparing for war against France, independently of that alliance.

In early 1792, the Emperor of Austria decided to start military operations against revolutionary France to restore the monarchy of Louis XVI and his sister Marie-Antoinette. The French Legislative Assembly forestalled him, however, by declaring war against Austria, which was supported by Prussia.

Numerous and well-armed Prussian and Austrian troops, joined by émigré regiments from Coblenz, marched on Paris. Duke Wilhelm Ferdinand of Brunswick, who was in charge of Austro-Prussian troops, issued a vicious manifesto threatening to raze Paris to the ground if the pre-revolutionary order and the rule of Louis XVI were not restored.

The French army, which the revolutionaries inherited from the monarchy, was not prepared for war. The Queen, who had come from Austria and incited it to speed up the military invasion of

France, disclosed the French military plans to the enemy. The officers' corps, which consisted of monarchist gentry, was not reliable, while the army lacked discipline.

Detachments of home guard began to be formed in response to the appeal by the Legislative Assembly, which proclaimed "Homeland in Danger". More and more regiments started coming to Paris from all over the country. The armed representatives of Marseilles sang "La Marseillaise", which was to become the militant hymn of the revolution and later on the French national anthem. It was in those days that Danton proclaimed from the rostrum of the Legislative Assembly: "Boldness, and again boldness, and always boldness!"

Ever since that time struggle on two fronts—against the treacherous monarchy inside the country and counter-revolution from without—has been called the "Jacobin defence". In 1938, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia repeatedly cited that tested revolutionary form of struggle and suggested that it should be used against internal reaction and Henlein followers, on the one hand, and against the Nazi armies stationed at the border with Czechoslovakia, on the other.

In August 1792, a communal insurrection flared up in France. Under the new circumstances the revolutionary army, which was formed to repel the attacks of the counter-revolutionaries, soon developed military spirit, discipline, courage and manoeuvrability. Though it was underfed, poorly clothed, almost barefoot and poorly armed, it sent

the Prussians, Austrians and the Coblenz armies reeling back. Just like in the time of the Hussites, the revolutionary enthusiasm of the people proved more effective than the army of indifferent mercenaries, though well trained and armed to the teeth. The first stage of wars waged by revolutionary France ended with its glorious victory at Valmy on September 20, 1792: the invaders were driven away and their commander, the Duke of Brunswick, barely escaped captivity...

Subsequent history showed that attempts to export counter-revolution into France did not stop there. Louis XVI, deposed in the course of the popular uprising, was executed together with Queen Marie-Antoinette. The first coalition of feudal Europe disintegrated and was replaced by another alliance in which Britain was to play the leading role. It took shape in 1799 when Holland, Spain, the Kingdom of Sicily, Venice and the Duchy of Tuscany joined what remained of the earlier alliance. Tsarist Russia became one of the leaders of the counter-revolutionary coalition. The whole of monarchist Europe and all the reactionary forces joined ranks. For example, the Younger Pitt, a leading British statesman and one of the main organisers of the coalition war against revolutionary France, annually gave 5 million pounds on all sorts of subversion. His personal agents received tremendous rewards of up to 2,500 pounds a month. More often than not agents recruited from the clergy and the gentry engaged in dirty subversive activities in France.

Leaving aside for a moment the distant and

not so distant past, one can see that nothing new had been invented nowadays and that the present-day exporters of counter-revolution employ the same "tested" methods, naturally, updated in keeping with the present level of scientific and technological progress.

In the spring of 1793 a counter-revolutionary mutiny sprang up in Vendée and Brittany, backward areas in Western France, led by the gentry and the clergy, who managed to win the cowed peasantry to their side. The mutineers were backed by Britain, which entered war against France in February 1793. General Dumouriez' betrayal also played into the hands of counter-revolution and seriously aggravated the military situation.

The defeat of the revolution and the overthrow of the Jacobins was brought about by a counter-revolutionary coup of the 9th Thermidor (July 27, 1794) organised by the big bourgeoisie. That was the end of the onward development of the French bourgeois revolution. Its downward trend began when the revolution switched from defending itself from exported counter-revolution to predatory wars, and made attempts to attain hegemony in Europe, especially under Napoleon.

Reaction, which followed the coup, failed, however, to annul the main gains of the French Revolution or restore socio-political relations which existed before it. "Although it was crushed," Lenin wrote, "the French Revolution was nevertheless triumphant, because it laid down for the whole world such firm foundations of bourgeois de-

mocracy, of bourgeois freedom, that they could never be uprooted.”¹

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION OF 1848

The events of 1848 developed in about the same way in Germany and Austria. Internal counter-revolution there was fairly strong and at first could do without outside help.

In those years the Austrian empire was a motley state consisting of separate ethnical units which languished in the Austrian “prison of nations”.

The revolutionary movements, which emerged in Austria under the impact of the February 1848 revolution in France, threatened to split the Empire. Internal reaction made a clever use of the national heterogeneity of the country and kindled national enmity by pitting neighbouring peoples one against another. Deeply rooted mutual dislikes and hostility, which were deliberately fostered, served the same purpose. All that made it possible to suppress the Vienna uprising with the help of soldiers from Southern Slavonic territories, in particular the Croatian units commanded by Jelačić. The June uprising in Prague was trampled upon by the Austrian troops commanded by a rabid reactionary, General Windisch-Graetz. All this was nothing but the export of counter-revolution, though it took place within an enormous conglomeration of different nations.

¹ V. I. Lenin, “First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education, May 6-19, 1919”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1974, p. 372.

The export of counter-revolution in its "pure form" took place in the spring of 1849 when the Hungarian people rose in a revolt and drove away Austrian troops. The Hapsburgs were overthrown and Hungary was proclaimed independent. Peasants started seizing land from the landlords... The new revolutionary government of Hungary was led by Lajos Kossuth.

The Austrian imperial authorities were panic-stricken, aware that the victory of the Hungarian revolution could initiate the decline of the entire Empire, should other nations within it follow the example of Hungary and rise to fight for their freedom. The Emperor of Austria, who knew that he would be unable to stamp out the Hungarian revolution single-handed, turned to Emperor Nicholas I of Russia for help. The watch-dog of Europe hastened to dispatch the 100,000-strong army led by General Paskevich. Tsarist troops helped to suppress the revolution in Hungary, making it possible for feudal monarchist counter-revolution to triumph throughout Austria.

CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE PARIS COMMUNE

The Paris Commune, the first attempt to form a proletarian state in history, was proclaimed in March 1871 in Paris surrounded by the Prussian army: France was in a state of war with Prussia at that time.

The Commune existed for 72 days and managed to accomplish a great deal in that short pe-

riod, proclaiming many a progressive reform in the interests of the broad sections of the working people. To this day it serves as a luminous example giving people inspiration.

It became a prototype of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, which created the first socialist state of workers and peasants and ushered in a new era in the history of mankind. Lenin thought highly of the experience of the Paris Commune. "...It stirred," he wrote, "the socialist movement throughout Europe, it demonstrated the strength of civil war, it dispelled patriotic illusions, and destroyed the naive belief in any efforts of the bourgeoisie for common national aims. The Commune taught the European proletariat to pose concretely the tasks of the socialist revolution."¹

The Commune was established when it became absolutely clear that France faced a defeat in its war against Prussia.

French troops capitulated in the battle at Sedan and the Emperor gave himself up. As a result of the revolutionary thrust of Paris workers the Second Empire was overthrown and the republic proclaimed. The working people were, however, poorly organised, which enabled the bourgeois liberals to attain power. They set up the so-called Government of National Defence, which included many sworn enemies of democracy, among them Louis Adolphe Thiers. From the out-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Lessons of the Commune", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, 1978, p. 477.

set that government wanted to come to terms with the enemy rather than to mobilise the people to rebuff the Prussian army that sieged Paris. It feared most of all the growing activity of the patriotically- and revolutionary-minded mass of the people. Marx wrote that that government "...had inherited from the empire ... its dread of the working class".¹

The reactionaries, who had entrenched themselves in the government, were working towards the speedy ending of the war on any terms and towards surrendering Paris to the invaders, hoping to stamp out the growing revolution with the help of the occupation army.

In February 1871, the onerous and humiliating armistice was signed with Prussia. It was then that the people of Paris rebelled against the "Government of National Defection".

For Thiers revolutionary Paris rather than the Prussian army was enemy No. 1. Prussia, too, was no less scared of the armed people. Bismarck, tied with Thiers by class solidarity, quickly came to terms with him and the most "reliable" French regiments were released from captivity. By that time Thiers, together with his cabinet, had fled to Versailles outside Paris, and his army now grew from 40,000 to 100,000 soldiers. It was strong enough for Thiers to start a campaign against the Commune.

¹ *The General Council of the First International, 1870-1871. Minutes*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967, p. 340.

In this way the export of counter-revolution was carried out in yet another form, which was described by Marx as "the conspiracy of the ruling class to break down the Revolution by a civil war carried on under the patronage of the foreign invader..."¹

The massacre of the Paris revolutionaries ended on May 28, 1871, at the Mur des fédérées in the Père Lachaise cemetery, where 30,000 Communards perished in the last battle.

The workers' revolution of 1871 was drowned in blood. Thousands of the best sons and daughters of the French people perished in the struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland and for the emancipation of its working people from the capitalist yoke. The overall number of those killed, imprisoned and sentenced to hard labour in exile amounted to 70,000.

Exposing the criminal collusion between the French bourgeoisie and the Prussian Junkers, Karl Marx wrote in the address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, *The Civil War in France*, issued on May 30, 1871, two days after the downfall of the Commune, that "...for the common massacre of the proletariat ..." two armies joined forces—"the conquering and the conquered hosts".²

Marx concluded his address, predicting that "working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980, p. 103.

² *Ibid.*, p. 104.

forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them."¹

MEXICO: ROBBERY IN BROAD DAYLIGHT

American monopolies, enjoying the unlimited support of the imperialist state, have always waged wars for new sources of raw materials, cheap workforce and markets. Mexico, highly developed and rich in mineral resources, was the first victim of their plunder. A well-known American Communist William Z. Foster offered a vivid account of this period of American history in his book *Outline Political History of the Americas*.

The Mexico-United States War of 1846-1848 "resulted in the biggest land steal in the history of such wars, Mexico being stripped of over one-half her territory. This war left behind it several major negative consequences, which are still being acutely felt a century later. First, Mexico continues to experience the destructive economic effects of this predatory war—its loss to the United States of vast areas of its richest farming, cattle-grazing, and fruit-raising lands. It also lost immense oil fields, huge copper deposits, and incalculable amounts of other natural resources. The general results of these losses have been to cripple Mexico's

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

economic development, not only during the past century, but also in the present. For example, one of the most serious handicaps of present-day Mexico is a great shortage of crop and pasture lands, its total being some 200 million acres, whereas, in the states of Texas, California, New Mexico, and Arizona, which were torn away from Mexico, there are about 265 million acres of pasture and plow land, generally superior in quality.”¹

In the first 100 years of its existence, the United States, pursuing its expansionist policy, seized the bigger part of Mexico, the Hawaiis and some other territories.

The thirteen states that initially formed the United States and occupied a relatively narrow strip on the north-eastern coast of the Atlantic with an area of 2,302 square kilometres evolved, as a result of forced, including military, expansion, into a powerful federation of 50 states occupying a vast territory of 9,364 square kilometers.

LATIN AMERICA: ONE INVASION AFTER ANOTHER

The United States exploited struggle against colonisers coming to the two American continents from different countries of the Old World to spread its influence over Latin American and Caribbean countries, which with the passage of time fell under the sway of American monopoly capital. It will be no exaggeration to say that the Uni-

¹ W. Z. Foster, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, International Publishers, New York, 1951, p. 198.

ted States would hardly have been so strong and rich, had it not had an access to cheap raw materials of Latin America, from where it imports about three-fourths of the raw materials it needs often at a price fixed by itself. . .

The early 20th century witnessed the imperialist division of the world, and the United States hurled itself into fierce competition with its partners in plunder, resorting now and then under various pretexts to the tested method of armed invasion. In the period from 1903 to 1924 Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Nicaragua, Haiti, Guatemala, Panama and Honduras were subjected to acts of aggression. General Smedley D. Butler, who spent most of his life taking part in that kind of "military operations", subsequently described his career as follows:

"I spent thirty-three years and four months in active service as a member of our country's most agile military force—the Marine Corps. I served in all commissioned ranks from second lieutenant to major-general. And during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street, and for the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism . . .

"Thus, I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank to collect revenues in . . . I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Hon-

duras 'right' for American fruit companies in 1903. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested."¹

This and other instances of arbitrariness perpetrated by the United States were cited by famous American economist Victor Perlo in his book *American Imperialism*.

¹ Victor Perlo, *American Imperialism*, International Publishers, New York, 1951, p. 13.

RECENT HISTORY

INVADERS JOIN FORCES

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia, which established the dictatorship of the proletariat and created conditions for the triumph of a new social system without exploitation of man by man, was of great historic importance. A new era, that of proletarian revolutions, was ushered in.

International imperialism responded to the October revolution with bitter hostility and sought to eliminate the Soviet state from the early days of its existence.

All the reactionary forces both in Russia itself and beyond its boundaries teamed up to oppugn the victorious revolution.

The capitalists of France, Britain, Germany, the United States, Belgium and other countries had for many decades been seizing key positions in the economy of the Russian Empire, profiting from the ruthless exploitation of the working people. Naturally, they were unwilling to lose the opportunity of squeezing maximum profit from Russia.

The revolutionary events in Russia and the workers' and national liberation movements mounting all over the world under their direct impact sowed fear and confusion among the exploiters. They were afraid that the example set by the Rus-

sian workers and peasants might be followed by others. Lenin wrote in this connection that "their only worry is to prevent the sparks of our fire from falling on their roofs".¹

With the world war still going on, the main forces of the two imperialist camps engaged in it were tied to the fronts. Till the spring of 1918 they organised and supported counter-revolutionary outbursts within Russia itself, kindling the civil war there and giving the counter-revolutionaries all kinds of support, above all, material help. Hostility to the young Soviet republic evolved into a direct interference in its domestic affairs and then into an armed intervention. Counter-revolution was exported in the most frank way.

The exploiting classes in Russia, which had been overthrown by the socialist revolution, became the lackeys of the foreign invaders, ready to allow international imperialism to divide and plunder their country in a bid to restore the old order. As a result the external and internal counter-revolutionaries joined forces.

Extensive aid given by imperialist states which supplied their class allies with weapons, munitions, food, and money, on the one hand, and their open armed invasion, on the other, were intended to thwart the triumphant development of Soviet rule and to undermine the high prestige it had won on the world scene by proclaiming a "war to war".

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech to Propagandists on Their Way to the Provinces, January 23 (February 5) 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 1974, p. 513.

Joint internal and external reaction wanted to change or reverse the course of history. The invasion started by German imperialists in February 1918 was joined by all the major imperialist powers—the north of the Soviet republic was occupied by British, French and American troops in the spring and summer of 1918; Japanese, British and American invaders appeared in the Far East, to be followed by French, Italian and Canadian troops; British divisions invaded Central Asia and Baku. Wherever the invaders came, they toppled the Soviet authorities, installed White Guard counter-revolutionary dictatorships and brutal occupation regimes, and shamelessly plundered the wealth of the occupied territories and their inhabitants.

In their turn, the German imperialists seized all the Baltic states, the greater part of Byelorussia, the Ukraine, the Don Area, the Crimea and Georgia. After eliminating the Soviet system, they brought the bourgeoisie and landlords back to power. Hetman Skoropadsky, a former tsarist army general and big land-owner, was made the ruler of the Ukraine. The Germans also propped up General Krasnov, who was elected chieftain by the counter-revolutionary Cossack elite in the Don Area.

As a result the Soviet republic found itself fighting fiercely on all the fronts. However, for all the danger created by the foreign intervention, it initially spread only in the outskirts of the Soviet republic. To penetrate still deeper inside the country, international reaction decided to use the Cze-

choslovak Corps. The latter consisted of Czechs and Slovaks, who had served in the Austro-Hungarian army and had been taken prisoner by the Russians during the First World War. After signing the Brest Peace Treaty, the Soviet government allowed the Corps to be evacuated to France through Vladivostok. The Corps' commanders, who sold their services to imperialists, talked the soldiers into taking part in anti-Soviet activities. Their mutiny soon encompassed an enormous territory from Penza to Vladivostok as long as the trains carrying the Czechoslovak Corps stretched. The Entente came out in defence of the mutineers, who received more than 100,000 rifles and other ammunition from the US alone.

The mutiny of the Czechoslovak Corps triggered off counter-revolutionary attacks in the Volga Area, the Urals and Siberia. The counter-revolutionary forces succeeded in overthrowing the Soviet authorities in the area from the Volga to Vladivostok and setting up a counter-revolutionary "government" of the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Constitutional Democrats in Samara. Similar "governments" were also established in Omsk and Ekaterinburg.¹

A significant section of the Czechoslovak Corps, however, sharply denounced the mutiny. In late May, 1918, the founding congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party took place in Russia, which called for the establishment of Czechoslovak Red Army units. Even before the mutiny

¹ Now Sverdlovsk.—*Ed.*

started, more than 6,000 soldiers took the side of the Soviets, about 3,000 soldiers joined the Red Army and all in all about 12,000 Czechs and Slovaks fought in the Red Army during the civil war.

External reaction exploited the plight of the Soviet republic and launched subversive activities to form counter-revolutionary organisations. The invaders financed the activities carried out by Socialist Revolutionary Savinkov and his organisation, which kindled mutinies in 23 cities and towns of Central Russia. A serious coup was prepared in Moscow by Lockhart, who headed the British mission. The Entente launched a severe economic blockade of Soviet Russia.

The fact that the enormous difficulties of that period were successfully overcome revealed the inexhaustible potential of the revolutionary people in resisting their enemies. Guided by Lenin, the Russian Communists mobilised all their forces to repel internal and external counter-revolution. The Soviet government announced: "The socialist homeland is in danger!"—and called upon the people to defend it. The Communist Party guided all the activities of the Soviet state in organising the country's defence and in turning it into a military camp. Under its leadership the workers and the toiling peasants of Russia entered the patriotic, revolutionary war to liberate themselves from the invaders and domestic counter-revolution, and won.

No matter what measures were employed—the military "pressure" brought to bear on the Soviet republic, the setting of neighbouring states against

it, counter-revolutionary mutinies or attempts at "joint" marches against Moscow—nothing gave world reaction the desired effect. For nearly three years Russian workers and peasants had to wage simultaneously the patriotic war against international imperialism and the civil war against the forces of internal counter-revolution. The historic victory of the Soviet republic provided a graphic illustration to Lenin's idea that "a nation in which the majority of the workers and peasants realise, feel and see that they are fighting for their own Soviet power, for the rule of the working people, for the cause whose victory will ensure them and their children all the benefits of culture, of all that has been created by human labour—such a nation can never be vanquished".¹

The working people in capitalist countries greatly helped the Soviet people in their just struggle. The proletariat throughout the world sympathised with the Russian revolution, welcomed the accomplishments of the emergent Soviet state and rendered it all types of help. Action committees were set up in many countries under the motto "Hands Off Russia!". Workers in Britain, France and other countries staged strikes and refused to handle arms and military equipment sent to the invaders and the White Guards.

The United States, the richest and most powerful country in the capitalist world, used its tremendous material resources to support the coun-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at a Meeting of the Railway-men of Moscow Junction, April 16, 1919", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 319.

ter-revolutionary forces and was most active in the invaders' alliance. Apart from organising the armed invasion, American diplomats, military figures and statesmen directly participated in all sorts of anti-Soviet activities. They were involved in conspiracies and in cobbling up all sorts of coalitions against Soviet Russia. In his "Letter to American Workers" Lenin wrote in this connection that "... the American multi-millionaires, these modern slave-owners, have turned an exceptionally tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism. . ."¹

In 1922, the last units of the invaders were driven out of Soviet Russia—the Japanese pulled out of Vladivostok to their islands.

"It was only because of the Party's vigilance and its strict discipline," Lenin said, "because the authority of the Party united all government departments and institutions, because the slogans issued by the Central Committee were adopted by tens, hundreds, thousands and finally millions of people as one man, because incredible sacrifices were made—it was only because of all this that the miracle which occurred was made possible. It was only because of all this that we were able to win in spite of the campaigns of the imperialists of the Entente and of the whole world having been repeated twice, thrice and even four times."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Letter to American Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 62.

² V. I. Lenin, "Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B). March 29-April 5, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, 1977, p. 446.

PLOTTING AGAINST SOVIET HUNGARY

The Hungarian Soviet republic was proclaimed in Budapest on March 21, 1919. Lenin wholeheartedly hailed that proletarian revolution, when he wrote: "... We are also seeing the seed sown by the Russian revolution springing up in Europe."¹ The Hungarian Revolution was led by Communists who had learnt from the experience of the Russian Revolution, among them Béla Kun, Tibor Szamuely and Ferenc Münnich.

The Soviet republic in Hungary was proclaimed in extremely complex external and internal circumstances. The world bourgeoisie was frightened by the spreading influence of the victorious Russian Revolution and the possible victories of the revolutionaries in West European countries. The establishment of the Soviet republic in Hungary triggered off a new wave of fury among the imperialists and enhanced their fear. Economic blockade and armed invasion—methods that had already been tested against Soviet Russia—were also used against Soviet Hungary.

The Hungarian Soviet Republic lasted for 133 days, that is, almost twice as long as the Paris Commune. The republican government issued a number of revolutionary decrees, among them those on the nationalisation of factories, mines, banks and transport, on the introduction of foreign trade

² V.I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B), March 18-23, 1919", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 224.

monopoly, and on the 8-hour workday. Industrial enterprises were run by workers' councils and government commissars. State social insurance was extended not only to industrial and office workers but also to agricultural labourers. The church was separated from the state and the school from the church.

The republican government also took measures to improve the working and living conditions of the working people. A law on universal suffrage was issued, which also applied to the soldiers. Early April saw elections to the revolutionary Soviets.

All the land-owners' estates exceeding 57 hectares in area were confiscated and handed over to production cooperatives. The regular Red Army was set up.

When all is said and done, the world bourgeoisie and the imperialist powers had enough reason to be enraged. Colonel Edward H. House, a close associate of American President Woodrow Wilson, wrote in his diary: "March 22, 1919: . . . Bolshevism is gaining ground everywhere. Hungary has just succumbed. We are sitting upon an open powder magazine and some day a spark may ignite it. . ."¹

The American press openly urged the Entente troops to immediately occupy Budapest and "teach Hungary a lesson".

¹ *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House. The Ending of the War*, Boston and New York, 1928, Vol. 4, p. 389.

Soviet Russia warmly greeted Soviet Hungary but was unable to lend considerable effort or money to help the Hungarian revolutionaries because of its own exceptionally complex situation created by the foreign invasion and the civil war.

Western capitalist countries led by the United States refused to recognise the Hungarian Soviet republic. The economic blockade declared by them was to break the "impudent" Bolsheviks and subjugate the republic. Herbert Hoover, who headed the American Relief Administration to give food aid to Europe, cynically said that they were not going to supply the Hungarian republic with grain. In this connection Lenin wrote that the imperialist bourgeoisie was brazen enough to "make the following suggestion to the Hungarian government: 'You reject Soviet power and we'll give you bread.'"¹

The French expeditionary corps on the Balkans which was ready to be sent to Soviet Russia, and troops of the neighbouring bourgeois states—Czechoslovakia and Romania—were used against Soviet Hungary. In April 1919, the French invaders occupied Szeged, a major Hungarian city where, protected and supported by Entente troops, a centre of internal counter-revolution was established and counter-revolutionary Hungarian troops began to be formed under the command of Admiral Miklos Horthy of the Austro-Hungarian Navy.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Food and War Situation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 527.

Beginning with the early days of its existence the republic found itself surrounded by fronts and the economic blockade. The situation was dramatic because the supreme army command, which consisted of right-wing Social Democrats, and some officers treacherously took the side of the Entente. The exporters of counter-revolution celebrated triumph.

Nevertheless, the Hungarian Communists said "no" to the demands made by the Entente countries and mobilised the working people to rebuff the enemy. In the second half of May, the Red Army launched a counter-offensive, cleared the right bank of the Tisza from Romanian troops and, chasing the withdrawing Czechoslovak troops, thrust deep into the Slovak territory. The Slovak Soviet Republic was proclaimed in Prešov.

Needless to say, this alarmed the imperialists of the Entente who convened the Paris Peace Conference and agreed to bring stronger pressure to bear on the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Georges Clemenceau, who chaired the conference, sent to Budapest a note warning categorically that, should the Entente powers fail to be notified within two weeks that the Hungarian Red Army complied with the Entente's directives and halted, they would send troops to Hungary. At the same time Clemenceau assured that the opposite side would also withdraw its troops and invite representatives of the Hungarian republic to the peace conference (which would have meant the official recognition of Soviet Hungary).

In fact it was nothing but trickery so character-

istic of imperialist politicians because Clemenceau had not even for a moment thought of fulfilling the promises he gave. Though the government of the Hungarian republic withdrew its troops from the north of the country, the Romanian army stayed on the Hungarian territory.

Under the circumstances, internal counter-revolution reared its head and organised disturbances in some cities of the country. The Red Army's attempts to attack Romanian troops in July 1919 met with a fiasco as a result of the betrayal by the chief of staff and other senior officers. It suffered defeat on the Tisza and, pressed on by the superior forces, retreated to Budapest.

Meanwhile, the majority of right-wing Social Democrats within the Council of People's Commissars organised a plot against the government of the Hungarian Soviet republic, and it was forced to resign on August 1, 1919.

In this way the Soviet government was overthrown in Hungary by the joint efforts of the imperialist intervention from without and internal counter-revolution and also as a result of the treachery of the Social Democrats who had wormed themselves into the country's government.

Miklos Horthy established a regime of bloody terror. His officers, together with déclassé elements, tortured Communists and patriots, throwing them hand- and foot-bound into the Danube, hanging them on street lamp posts and dragging them tied to carriages along the streets. White terror took the toll of more than 5,000; 40,000 were thrown into prisons and 70,000 emigrated.

WESTERN COUNTRIES BETRAY THE SPANISH REPUBLIC

The victory of the Popular Front parties in Spain in February 1936, the establishment of the Popular Front Government and its first progressive reforms enraged the fascist rulers of Germany and Italy. Spain was producing a revolutionising effect on the peoples in other countries and stimulated their struggle against reaction and fascism. The news of the victory of the Popular Front parties during the French parliamentary elections in April-May 1936 caused another bout of hatred among world reaction.

Seeking to crush the Popular Front with active German and Italian support, the reactionary Spanish officers' clique headed by General Franco started an armed coup against the legitimate republican government. The overt military intervention by Germany and Italy that followed, took place in an atmosphere of criminal connivance and even support by the ruling elites of the "great Western democracies"—Britain, France and the US. The policy of "non-intervention" proclaimed by Léon Blum, a right-wing leader of the French Socialists, cleared the way for the export of counter-revolution to Spain.

When the Spanish people were bitterly fighting Franco's mutineers and the German and Italian invaders, the Soviet Union was the only country to give active and extensive support to the Spanish Republican Government. The Soviet working people realised full well that the struggle

against fascism in Spain was the common cause of the whole of progressive mankind rather than a private affair of the Spaniards.

The Soviet Union helped the Spaniards in every way it could, beginning with diplomatic support, economic and military aid and ending with the personal participation of thousands of Soviet volunteers, who joined the international brigades and, together with Spaniards, Germans and the French, defended the approaches to Barcelona and the sky over Madrid.

The Spanish republic was bleeding to death while the Western "democracies" shammed "non-intervention" turning a deaf ear to the demands of the progressive public to help the legally elected government of that country. Their wait-and-see policy encouraged the aggressor and proved ruinous for their own countries.

The policy pursued by Germany and Italy aimed at stamping out the revolution in Spain and, besides, had other far-reaching goals—to weaken the positions of Britain and France and to create conditions for wider acts of aggression in Europe. The German leaders cynically declared that they considered Spain as a testing ground for their weapons. That was why the non-interference course pursued by the ruling elites of Western "democracies" amounted to the betrayal of their national interests, the betrayal of their peoples.

... I remember Parisians walking through the city in a traditional march from the Place de la Bastille to the Place de la Nation on July 14, 1938. The demonstrators were carrying red banners and

collecting money to purchase medicines for the Spanish republic. They chanted slogans: "Open the borders! Planes to Spain!"

I also recall being told a party secret of how in a small harbour on the French coast of the Atlantic fishermen transported volunteers and medicines to Spain in their frail fishing boats at night. Those common Frenchmen preserved the honour of proud France, the country of five revolutions, but they did it, defying the will of the mercenary, depraved and defeatist government.

HAND-IN-HAND WITH FASCISM

The Spanish War was nothing but an overture to the Second World War. In a bid to revenge itself with counter-revolution and to eliminate the Soviet Union, world reaction unleashed a bloody slaughter, which involved 110 million soldiers from 72 countries and during which more than 50 million died! History knew no other instance of such a horrendous export of counter-revolution!

The common aim of the imperialists in all countries was to destroy the Soviet Union and its socialist gains. The objective development of the capitalist world, however, sharpened inter-imperialist contradictions, while the fear that a great economic potential would concentrate on the Rhine (incidentally, the German industrial and military potential was restored after the First World War not without support from across the Atlantic) split the single imperialist front.

The Second World War was nurtured by the

forces of international imperialist reaction and unleashed by the most aggressive states—Nazi Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan—with the aim of dividing the world anew. It broke out on September 1, 1939, when the Nazi armies invaded Poland.

The war started between the two coalitions of the imperialist powers and developed into a just anti-fascist war on the part of all the states fighting against the fascist bloc. The war changed its nature when the Soviet Union entered the war, being treacherously attacked by Nazi Germany shortly after the two countries had signed a non-aggression treaty.

But for the political, economic and military support given by the “great Western democracies” to Nazi Germany on the eve of the war now publicly now covertly, Hitler would have never dared to annex Austria, occupy Czechoslovakia and attack the Soviet Union. In the post-war years, the world public has come to know many convincing facts, documents and other materials attesting to the verity of this conclusion.

Of considerable interest from this point of view is the book *Your M.P.*, which was published in Britain in 1944 and was written by a leading representative of the left-wing Labourists who used the pen-name of Gracchus. The author left no doubt about the fact that the British monopoly bourgeoisie backed the aggressive policy pursued by Nazi Germany. By way of illustration he cites C. T. Culverwell, Conservative MP, who said during the Munich debate in the House of Com-

mons virtually the following: "I ask those who hate Hitler . . . what has Hitler done of which we can reasonably complain? . . ." He went on to say: "I can even visualise our troops fighting side by side with the Germans to defeat the Bolshevik menace."¹

In his turn, Winston Churchill, who was the first of the British statesmen to realise the need to come out against Nazi aggression and to ensure Britain's participation in the anti-fascist coalition together with the USSR, was in fact a sworn enemy of the Soviet Union.

Gracchus published in his book a number of very eloquent pronouncements by Winston Churchill. For example, when the First World War was over, he formulated the following slogan: "Peace to the German people; war on the Bolshevik tyranny!" His references to the Soviet Union throughout the period between the two wars were similarly inimical. Soviet Russia, Churchill asserted in 1919, was a "foul combination of criminality and animalism". In 1920, he called the Soviet people "the avowed enemies of civilisation" and "crocodiles with master minds". Later on, he came up with "the blood-dyed tyrants" and "filthy butchers" (1924), "diabolical machinery" and "dark-conspirators" (1926) and "degraded Russian barbarism" in 1927.² (Characteristically enough, decades later, the Iron Lady who worshipped

¹ Cited from *Your M.P.* by Gracchus, Victor Gollancz LTD, London, 1944, p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Churchill resorted to the rhetorics of her idol every time she spoke about the Soviet Union.)

The sponsors of the Anglo-German Fellowship came from the most influential aristocratic and bourgeois circles of Great Britain. The Fellowship was formed after Hitler had achieved power in Germany, and after it became clear that he wanted, in the words of *Mein Kampf*, Germany to become "the lord of the Earth". Among the members of the Fellowship were British and German industrialists, politicians and the military. The London branch of the Anglo-German Fellowship was on several occasions visited by von Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister, Field-Marshal von Blomberg, at one time Hitler's Minister for War, and von Haden, then Adjutant in the S.S. to Himmler, head of Hitler's Gestapo.

In the early years of the Second World War the British army lacked weapons and munitions whereas Germany had them in excess, because Czechoslovakia and some other European countries now under Hitler as a result of the defeatist policy pursued by Britain and France, produced more than enough weapons. Germany, in fact, had restored its military might even earlier, directly aided by Western monopolies which had been supplying Germany and Italy with raw materials, industrial commodities and weapons right up to the beginning of the war. For example, a fortnight before the declaration of the war the British *News Chronicle* reported: "The London Rubber Exchange enjoyed almost a record turnover owing to a German order for 4,000 tons. The price shot

up . . . Germany is reported to have bought 17,000 tons already this month—two months' normal consumption."¹ It was echoed by the *Evening Standard*, which reported: "To execute the orders in time, heavy withdrawals were made from stores in the United Kingdom. A third of our stocks of rubber and a quarter of our supplies of nickel have gone and are on their way to Germany."²

Even later, during the "phoney war" of 1939-1940, when the Allied Armies took cover in the Maginot Line bunkers, war-related raw materials, cotton, oil, industrial commodities and armaments kept coming to Germany from Britain through Italy, neutral at that time, and other countries, among them the United States. Later on weapons and munitions made of those raw materials were used against the French, British and American soldiers, pilots and seamen . . .

John F. Kennedy, the would-be president of the United States, who was at that time an ordinary journalist, wrote a book emphatically titled *Why England Slept*. Describing these, to put it mildly, incredible facts of English reality on the eve of the Second World War, he wrote:

"Indeed, during this period the fear of Communism, not of Nazi-ism, was the great British bogey. Germany, under Hitler, with its early programme of vigorous opposition to Communism, was looked on as a bulwark against the spread of the doctrine through Europe. Sir Arthur Bal-

¹ Cited from *Your M. P.*, p. 52.

² *Ibid.*

four,¹ speaking of the Russian danger, said, 'One of the greatest menaces to peace today is the totally unarmed condition of Germany.' 'Today that is strongly ironic.'²

"Ironical, but not strange," was the comment of Gracchus on John Kennedy's remark. He listed a dozen of banks and major companies which had Sir Arthur Balfour, one of the richest men in Britain, on their boards and concluded: "When he spoke on Germany and Russia, big money was speaking. And its aim was clear."³

BEHIND THE BACK OF THEIR SOVIET ALLY

The Second World War came to an end, but there has been no end to the export of counter-revolution. It keeps going on today in new forms and manifestations, often resorting to "improved" methods.

Even during the Second World War, when they were still the allies of the Soviet Union in the struggle against Nazism, the US and British politicians were hatching plans of suppressing the liberation movement in Europe. These were the goals of the diplomatic activity of the two states.

¹ Sir Arthur Balfour, British Prime Minister who concluded in 1904 a treaty with France, laying the foundation for the Entente.—*Ed.*

² J. F. Kennedy, *Why England Slept*, Hutchinson and Co. (Publishers), LTD, London and Melbourne, 1940, p. 82.

³ *Your M. P.* by Gracchus, p. 20.

... In early 1945, the Soviet Army launched a sweeping offensive, transferring its military operations to German territory and approaching Berlin. The war was in its final phase.

On January 12, 1945, Soviet troops dealt an unprecedentedly strong blow at the Nazi army along the 700-kilometre-long frontline from the Niemen to the Carpathians and broke the powerful defences of the enemy, though the German well-fortified positions seemed to be unassailable strongholds. It is common knowledge that the offensive was undertaken a week ahead of schedule in connection with the message to the Soviet Supreme Commander-in-Chief by the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who spoke about the plight of British and American troops resulting from the German counter-offensive in the Ardennes area.

Democratic forces went from strength to strength in the liberated European countries and resolutely undertook to restore their national independence and sovereignty and to attain social progress.

By that time the Soviet Union enjoyed exceptionally high prestige in the world so that nobody could ignore it. All this had cleared the way to the Crimea Conference agreements, which corresponded to the anti-fascist and liberating nature of the war waged by the allies.

The heads of government of the three great powers of the anti-Hitler coalition—the USSR, the USA and Great Britain—met in conference from February 4 to 11, 1945, in the Livadia Palace outside Yalta. They first of all set forth and coordinated the further military plans of the Allies

and outlined the fundamental principles of their post-war policy with the aim of building stable peace and a system of international security. The heads of government of the three great powers agreed on the principles and forms of the unconditional surrender of Germany and its occupation and control. They also decided to set up occupation zones and a general control body, to exact reparations from Germany, to establish the United Nations Organisation, and resolved some other problems. Agreements on Germany were based on the resolutions on the demilitarisation and democratisation of the country. The Communiqué on the Crimea Conference said that the policy with respect to the future of Germany aimed "to destroy German militarism and Nazism and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world".

The heads of the three great powers passed the Declaration on Liberated Europe, which stated that they had agreed to coordinate between themselves the policy towards aiding the nations which had been liberated from the domination by Nazi Germany, and those of the former satellite states in their resolving of vital political and economic problems by democratic means.

Subsequently, during the cold war, whose inception is associated by many people with the notorious speech made by Winston Churchill in Fulton on March 5, 1946, the opponents of cooperation with the Soviet Union on both sides of the Atlantic tried hard to denigrate the Yalta accords. To this day they try to claim that the Western great

powers allegedly yielded their positions in the Crimea, letting the Soviet side to profit "at the expense of the West". A myth was circulated that President Roosevelt was a "sick man in Yalta", and because of his ill health hardly knew what he was doing and was unable to assess the consequences of the resolutions adopted at the conference.¹ The cold war apologists also widely circulated stories about the Soviet Union allegedly violating the Yalta resolutions later on, causing alienation among the former allies.

Western historians and propagandists contradict themselves here because, if the resolutions of the Crimea Conference were in the interests of the Soviet Union, why should it violate them?

Had our opponents been somewhat franker, they would have admitted that the leaders of the Western powers, aware of the need for an alliance with the USSR to ensure victory over Nazi Germany, had to conclude a number of agreements with the Soviet Union in keeping with the will of the Allied Nations but nevertheless remained loyal to their class interests and even then nurtured counter-revolutionary revanchist plans. For example, Churchill, who was the first among the capitalist world leaders to advocate the establishment of an anti-Hitler coalition together with the USSR, at the same time hoped that the Soviet Union would be bled white by that most exhaust-

¹ President Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, that is, two months after the end of the Crimea Conference and, according to medical record, his health sharply deteriorated only in the last weeks of his life.—*Ed.*

ing war and its Western allies would then "bring order into Europe". That was an open guideline towards the export of counter-revolution to European countries unwilling to restore their mercenary pre-war regimes. Churchill repeatedly postponed the opening of the Second Front in the West, preferring to airlift British and American troops to Italy or the Balkans where, according to his idea, they were to counter the revolutionary will of the people.

It is known that en route to the Crimea Winston Churchill met President Roosevelt in Yalta and had talks with him. The American record in the Maltese talks shows that Churchill "attached great importance to the speediest withdrawal of the German forces from Italy or their capitulation. He 'felt it was essential that we should occupy as much of Austria as possible as it was undesirable that more of Western Europe than necessary should be occupied by the Russians'."¹

The Crimea Conference paid much attention to the Polish question. The head of the Soviet delegation said that the Soviet Union had an interest in creating "a powerful, free and independent Poland". Western representatives had to agree with the fact that the Soviet-Polish border should be established in keeping with the national principle, that is, mostly along the so-called "Curzon Line" and that Poland's western border should be established along the Oder and Neisse.

¹ *Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers. The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945*, Wash., 1955, p. 543.

Acute political struggle flared up when the question of the Polish government was discussed. Churchill insisted that the reactionary anti-Soviet government in London should be installed in liberated Poland, though the legitimate Polish government formed in Lublin on June 21, 1944, was already functioning in Warsaw. The West wanted to have a reactionary anti-Soviet enclave in the centre of East European countries to be liberated by the Soviet Union and to embark upon the road of democracy and socialism.

The Soviet Union would not allow for the export of counter-revolution to Poland. The resolution passed by the conference left no chances for the reactionary Western politicians to restore the "sanation" regime in that country. Their plans fell through in the Crimea in 1945, as it was in Czechoslovakia first in 1948 and then in 1968, just like counter-revolution failed in Hungary in 1956 and during the Polish events of 1980-1982.

Some people in Western Europe do not conceal their sympathies with the Polish counter-revolutionary forces, which allegedly defend "human rights, freedom and independence" of their country. "There is no stronger solidarity than that which bounds us with the Polish people," they say in Paris and recall the old traditions of Franco-Polish friendship, which goes back to the time of the Polish uprisings of the 19th century, when Ignacy Lelewel, Adam Mickiewicz and Frédéric Chopin lived for a long time in exile in France and when Polish revolutionaries symbolised heroic struggle for progress.

This was a century and a half ago, but much has changed since that time both on the Seine and on the Vistula. What did bourgeois France, which clamoured so much about "the solidarity with the Polish people" do when the Nazi armies attacked Poland in 1939 and its freedom and the very existence were indeed jeopardized? Though French Prime Minister Daladier and British Prime Minister Chamberlain did declare war against Hitler, they did not even try to defend allied Poland. Those were the times of the so-called "phoney war" when 110 French and British divisions stood idle behind the Maginot Line, confronted with not more than 23 German divisions.

Marshal Keitel and General Jodl admitted at the Nuremberg trial that the German army was not ready for a war against Poland and France and Britain at the same time—it would have most certainly lost such a war. Shirking military operations, the French ruling elite was most active in the course of the ten months of the "phoney war" primarily in two directions, that is, in suppressing their own people and preparing anti-Soviet machinations.

Those who betrayed Poland 45 years ago tried again to encroach on its sovereignty today and to subordinate it to the imperialists' will. Relying on the moral and material support by their friends—the socialist countries—the Polish people managed to cut the channels of the export of counter-revolution.

We in Czechoslovakia had been betrayed by the West even before the Poles. In 1938, the British

and French allies betrayed us in Munich. Keitel and Jodl confirmed at the Nuremberg trial that 50 German divisions would have been unable to break through the Czechoslovak border fortifications and to win, because they were confronted by 35 Czechoslovak divisions, 100 French divisions and a big force of the Red Army, ready to come to our help. Our freedom and independence were also in grave danger at that time.

And what did bourgeois France do? Together with Britain, it allowed Hitler to trample Czechoslovakia underfoot. Socialist leader Léon Blum believed during the Munich talks that war was averted and a catastrophe avoided. Eleven months later the Second World War began...

UNDER THE GUISE OF "AID"

The United States is now the main "expert" in exporting counter-revolution, as it carried out several dozens of armed invasions in the post-war years and unleashed several wars of aggression, jeopardizing the peace and the lives of hundreds of millions of people.

The American powers that be try to find a specious ideological camouflage to disguise these old "traditional" methods.

The year of 1947 saw the emergence of the so-called Truman Doctrine, named after the man notorious for having given the order to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. By giving "help" to Greece and Turkey (to the tune of 400 million dollars), the US hoped to deal a blow

at the democratic and liberation movements in those countries and also to undermine the struggle waged by the people in other regions. The act was directed against the USSR and other socialist countries, as Greek and Turkish territories were to be used as a military-strategic springboard against them. The Doctrine was proclaimed in a clamorous anti-communist propaganda campaign. The implementation of that Doctrine enabled American imperialism to interfere directly in the domestic affairs of Greece when the developments in that country took a turn obviously unfavourable for the British imperialists¹, who had been lording it there, and for their monarchist-fascist stooges. American interference enabled the Greek monarchist fascists, then in the grips of a crisis, to remain in power and continue their policy of terror against the progressive forces fighting for their country's freedom and independence. In December 1947, a new decree was passed, which was fascist in nature and which outlawed the Communist Party of Greece as well as all the patriotic parties and organisations within the National Liberation Front. Any violation of the decree was punishable by death.

The intensification of fascist terror in Greece was a direct consequence of the application of the Truman Doctrine. The United States interfered directly in the domestic affairs of that coun-

¹ In October 1944 British troops landed in Greece under the pretext of liberating the country from the fleeing Nazi invaders.—*Ed.*

try by helping the monarchist fascists to drown the liberation movement in blood. "Defending freedom and democracy from Communism", the Americans guided repressions against the population, resorting to the shelling and bombing of residential quarters in cities, the use of napalm over vast territories, mass raids and imprisonment, and executions that became routine. Greece turned into a huge concentration camp. Aegean islands, lacking drinking water and infested with rats and snakes, came into notoriety after thousands of Greek patriots perished in exile there.

American "aid" led to political chaos and economic stagnation, putting Greece for years into bondage to American imperialism.

During the war against Nazism the Communist parties of Western Europe were in the front ranks of the fighters against the fascist plague and suffered the biggest losses in men. Suffice it to recall that the French Communist Party was called during that period "Parti des fusillés": fighting against the Nazi invaders, it lost 75,000 of its members. The same happened in Italy, Belgium, Greece and other countries.

The leading role played by the Communist parties in organising the resistance movement during the Second World War won them respect among people who relied more and more on the Communists as a progressive political force. After the victory over fascism the Communist parties moved to the fore of the political scene. Enjoying the support of the peoples, the Italian, French and Belgian Communists formulated the demand for their

participation in their countries' governments. Given the unity of the democratic and anti-fascist forces at the time the Communists fruitfully worked in their governments and spearheaded the struggle against the anti-national machinations by monopolies in the economic field, led the "battle for production" in France, worked towards the democratisation of the social system in Italy, and so on.

All the while reaction proved capable to disarm the military guerrilla units, and armed people's teams after the military operations were over... To have the Communists in the governments was just as frightening.

It was during that period that the Marshall Plan came into being, to "help many European countries to rehabilitate their economies". This was the declared aim, but in fact the hullabaloo around the "lofty" American initiative was meant to cloak the far-reaching goals. Seeing that the positions of the bourgeoisie had weakened significantly in West European countries, the American imperialists decided to give material aid to... the ruling classes to perpetuate the capitalist system and to consolidate the reactionary forces there.

When US Secretary of State George Marshall delivered a speech at Harvard University, expounding his Plan (which came into force in April 1948) on June 5, 1947, the bourgeois mass media little concerned themselves with its true significance, for example with the fact that the US sought to use the Plan to strengthen its hegemony in Western Europe and to create a united imperialist front

against the liberation movement, the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, which was taking shape at that time.

The granting of "aid" in keeping with the Marshall Plan was tied to terms that in fact meant undisguised American interference in the internal affairs of the "Marshallised" countries and the policy of diktat towards them. One of the preliminary conditions of getting "aid" was the removal of Communists from their governments. Pressure was brought to bear on the corresponding governments, and Communists were expelled—in Belgium in March 1947, in France and Italy in May 1947.

The operation was put into effect through well-adjusted mechanisms, functioning in accordance with the scenario prepared across the Atlantic. Czechoslovakia also had a certain role to play in it as an industrially developed country, which had traditional links with the West and was in the past among so-called "Western democracies".

CZECHOSLOVAKIA, 1948: REACTIONARY COUP FAILS

The Marshall Plan also played its sinister role in whipping up tensions in Czechoslovakia in late 1947 and early 1948. Following instructions from abroad, the domestic reactionary forces attempted a coup to oust the Communists from the government the way it had been done in France, Italy and Belgium.

Acute class struggle, which culminated in the February events in Czechoslovakia, was caused

by the striving of internal reaction, weakened by the peaceful revolutionary transformation in Czechoslovakia after the war, to regain the positions lost. In their turn, international monopolies were also interested in restoring the capitalist system as they had lost a great deal of property as a result of the agrarian reform and gradual nationalisation. Suffice it to say that a quarter of capital investments (according to Western estimates) in the country's economy was in the hands of the foreign monopolies, German, British, French, Swiss, Swedish, American, and so on. The actual influence of imported capital in the Czechoslovak economy by far exceeded its numerical strength because it was often enough for a company to invest a fairly modest sum to become a majority stockholder. For example, all the chemical and oil-processing enterprises, including the Pardubice factories, were controlled by the American Socony Vacuum Oil Company. The Company's legal office was headed by the notorious Laurence Steinhardt before he became US ambassador in Prague. During the 1946 elections he pinned hopes on the victory of the "moderates", that is to say, reactionary political parties, and frankly wrote about it to his chief in New York, predicting at the same time the subsequent return of the nationalised factories and plants to foreign monopolies.

Class struggle exacerbated in the country by late 1947. What was more, severe drought hit Czechoslovakia that summer and starvation stared its citizens in the face. Internal reaction tried to use the disaster against the people's democracy. The

Czechoslovak bourgeoisie still owned 49 per cent of all the enterprises and ran the whole of home and foreign trade. It also had at its disposal such important political levers as presidential and ministerial posts.¹ The bourgeoisie demanded that the nationalised enterprises should be transformed into joint-stock companies involving Czech and foreign capitalists, sabotaged the work of state-run enterprises and encouraged private trade and the black market. Backed by the right-wing Social Democrats, the bourgeoisie undertook to set up an anti-communist alliance within the National Front and other political organisations. President Eduard Beneš, who continued nurturing plans to restore the capitalist order, expanded links with the reactionary leaders actively helped by the British and American imperialists.

As far as foreign-policy orientation was concerned, the reactionary forces cited extensively the Marshall Plan as the only means which could allegedly save Czechoslovakia from imminent peril; but it was rejected by the government in July 1947. They tried to impress it upon the working people that Czechoslovakia would not survive without American aid. The reactionaries did everything to disorganise the economy, disrupt food supplies to the population and in this way breed dissatisfaction with the democratic system in the country.

¹ The National Front Government formed on April 4, 1945, comprised representatives of the Communist, Social Democratic, National Socialist and People's parties as well as some Slovak bourgeois parties.—*Ed.*

Such was the state of affairs in Czechoslovakia when, in February 1948, the Communists, supported by the working class and all the working people, demanded the nationalisation of all industrial enterprises employing more than 50 people and of foreign and home wholesale trade and the next stage of the agrarian reform.

Reaction decided to speed up the counter-revolutionary coup that had long been in the making. Certain nationalistic and reactionary elements closely connected with President Beneš became its motive force and organiser. On February 20, 1948, a group of ministers resigned in a bid to bring about the fall of the government headed at that time by the true son of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Klement Gottwald.

On the previous day US Ambassador Laurence Steinhardt unexpectedly returned from his vacations to Prague a month before the pre-planned date, coming by plane rather than by ship as had been expected. He went from the airport straight to his residence, where a reception was given that same day, with many right-wing Czechoslovak politicians attending it. The Czechoslovak News Agency ČTK reported the ambassador saying at the reception that the West had not abandoned hope that Czechoslovakia would change its decision and take part in the Marshall Plan. Steinhardt did not come from Washington empty-handed: he made it clear that a "more reasonable, moderate"—that is, pro-Western and anti-Soviet—government could expect to get a \$25 million worth credit. In other words, the ambassador

had brought a fairly concrete offering from across the Atlantic.

Precisely on February 20, 42 American officers came quite "unexpectedly" from West Germany to Prague for "vacations". By sheer "coincidence" American army formations deployed in Passau, Bavaria, started manoeuvres in the vicinity of Czechoslovak borders that February. To be sure, similarly "by chance" a train carrying American small arms was moving along the Czechoslovak border in those days.

The reactionaries were so certain of the success of the operation planned that they even made public the names of the future ministers.

The new administration headed by Beneš, with Jira as secretary and pro-Western General H. Pika as defence minister, was to erase the revolutionary gains of the people and to lay the groundwork for the restoration of the capitalist system. It became known that President Beneš was not only privy to the coup in preparation but was even behind it and he nourished the hope to get rid of the Communists through "parliamentary" means. That very day Gottwald warned him: "Mister President, I think you won't get away with it easily this time." London newspapers commenting the events wrote that Beneš had made the biggest blunder in his life.

All the attempts by the bourgeoisie to attract the people to its side failed, together with the manoeuvres of President Beneš, who at first refused to accept the resignation of twelve ministers. Discontent with his policy was growing with every

passing day, and there were mounting demands to accept the resignation of the reactionary ministers. Under pressure from the working class Beneš had to accept their resignation on February 25 and to agree to the new composition of the government of the revived National Front suggested by Gottwald.

In this way the Czechoslovak working class in alliance with the rest of the working people won a decisive battle against domestic and international reaction in February 1948 and embarked upon building a socialist society. *Rudé právo*, the central organ of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, published on February 28, 1948, a detailed analysis of the abortive attempt by world reaction to export counter-revolution into Czechoslovakia. "Internal and external reaction," the newspaper wrote, "wanted to turn Czechoslovakia into a colony of foreign imperialism by carrying out a coup and mercilessly persecuting all the advocates of people's democracy, especially the Communists . . .

"On this occasion, too, they resorted to the methods already tested in Spain before the war and in Greece after the war".

The newspaper went on to cite documents that proved that the counter-revolutionary putsch had been prepared through joint efforts both inside and outside the country. It wrote: "That the external reactionary forces were well informed about the forthcoming events was borne out by the fact that some foreign missions in Prague knew about the intention by twelve ministers to resign

already in the morning of February 20, that is, even before the resignation letters were written.

"An American journalist in Prague was spreading the information about the reactionary ministers resigning already at 10 a.m.; some news agencies reported the forthcoming event in the afternoon of February 20, that is, before the resignation was announced."

Analysing the international significance of the February events in Czechoslovakia, Klement Gottwald said at the April (1949) Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party: "In the sphere of foreign policy, the problem was whether our republic would follow unswervingly the road of alliance with the USSR, other Slavonic nations and all People's Democracies in Central and South-Eastern Europe in the future or would be torn away from the progressive democratic alliance and become again a target for the political machinations of the Western imperialists and a bridgehead for world reaction in its struggle against the People's Democracies and the Soviet Union. The February events decided the matter clearly and unequivocally—our people's democratic republic will not only continue its former policy of alliance with the Soviet Union and the other Slavonic nations but will resolutely pursue its policy and put it into the practice."¹

¹ *Documents on the February Events*, The Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Prague, 1948, p. 89.

THE UN FLAG AS A COVER...

The numerous variants of exporting counter-revolution used by world reaction to block the progressive course of history include the American imperialists' attempts to impose the neocolonialist system upon the nations which have taken to the road of national liberation, by manipulating decisions of such an authoritative international forum as the United Nations. As if in mockery, military units engaged in a patent armed invasion hoisted the blue UN flag, as was the case in Korea.

Exploiting the defeat suffered by Japanese militarism in the Second World War (incidentally, the allies won primarily thanks to the routing of the Quantung Army by Soviet troops), the American imperialists hurried to supersede it in Korea. Let it be recalled that American troops landed in Korea already after Japan had capitulated. After gaining a foothold in the southern part of the country, the US attempted to spread its influence all over Korea. Its aim was to check (with the help of arms as well) the development of the national liberation struggle and to perpetuate the positions of capitalism in that important region of Asia.

An entirely different stand was adopted by the Soviet Union, whose armies had entered North-Eastern China and Korea in the course of military operations against the Japanese militarists. The Soviet people justly believed that the Korean people had to be given a chance of independent

political and economic development after decades of fighting against Japanese colonialists.

The American Administration enjoyed in those years an obedient majority at the UN and hoped to turn Korea into its political satellite. The Soviet proposals on the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the formation of a provisional democratic government for the whole of Korea were sabotaged, while simultaneously measures were taken to suppress the democratic forces and prop up reaction in the southern part of the country.

In May 1948, the American occupation authorities held "elections" to the so-called national assembly in the conditions of unbridled terror and persecutions. The election farce ended with the establishment of the South Korean government headed by Syngman Rhee, a reactionary Korean politician who had long been living in the US. All attempts by the progressive democratic forces of North and South Korea to set up a common democratic government were constantly opposed by the Americans.

In August 1948, the Supreme People's Assembly of Korea, formed on the basis of elections held throughout the country, both in its northern and southern parts, adopted a constitution, proclaiming the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and formed its government. By late 1948 the Soviet government, in recognition of the right of the people to self-determination and out of respect for their sovereignty, pulled its troops out of Korea. The American authorities, however, re-

fused to follow the example of the Soviet Union and turned down the corresponding request by the Supreme People's Assembly.

In June 1949, the United Democratic Patriotic Front of Korea was formed of the representatives of parties and organisations in the two parts of the country on the initiative of some political and public organisations of South Korea. The Front proposed a plan for the peaceful reunification of two Koreas. Afraid to lose an important strategic stronghold, the American ruling elite did everything it could to prevent the establishment of integral and independent Korea. It brought pressure to bear in all directions with cynicism rarely to be met in international practice. For instance, the US Congress passed a law cutting off aid in the event of the formation in the Republic of Korea of a coalition government which includes one or more members of the Communist Party or the party in control of the government of Northern Korea.

The Front's proposal was rejected. Already at that time the American imperialists and their South Korean stooges cherished hopes to unite the country with the help of arms, that is, by exporting counter-revolution. Preparations were launched for such a "unification".

As soon as the reactionary government of Syngman Rhee came to power the United States signed a secret military agreement with it on forming a South Korean army under the control of the American military mission. The US started rendering South Korea military aid, which rea-

ched 110 million dollars by 1950. In late 1949, the South Korean army was already 100,000-strong and in January 1950, General William L. Roberts, chief of the US Military Advisory Group in South Korea, said that "the plan for a campaign against the North had been decided on".¹

The Americans constantly incited their South Korean stooges to unleash a war, promising the necessary material and moral support in "the struggle against Communism". According to plans nurtured by American politicians, the elimination of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was to show the Asian nations the might of world imperialism, to sap their confidence in the possibility to succeed in their liberation struggle and to weaken the national liberation movement.

Tensions that had long been whipped up at the 38th parallel burst up in a civil war unleashed by South Korea on June 25, 1950.

It was a local war that only fell short of turning into a world war. When Syngman Rhee's army failed to live up to the American expectations and reeled deep back into its territory, the US Administration decided to interfere in the conflict with its own armed forces. The Seventh US Fleet stationed at the Philippines headed for the Taiwan Strait. General Douglas Mac-Arthur was ordered to send the fleet and airforce to support Syngman Rhee's army.

American diplomacy tried to veil the armed

¹ *Documents and Materials Exposing the Instigators of the Civil War in Korea*, Pyöngyang, 1950, p. 7.

American invasion of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the United Nations' colours. Availing itself of the absence of the Soviet representative at the Security Council,¹ the US pushed through a resolution, which presented the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as an "aggressor", despite the obvious facts. Then another UN resolution called on all the UN member states to give aid to South Korea. American diplomacy resorted to still another UN resolution to camouflage the US invasion: American troops in Korea were designated as "UN troops" and allowed to use the flag of the United Nations.

All these resolutions violated the UN Charter, according to which all problems pertaining to the preservation of peace and security should be discussed with all the five permanent Security Council members participating, and resolution on them should be adopted unanimously. Furthermore, the resolutions were passed when the American invasion had already taken place, and their only purpose was to cover the American intervention with the UN authority. Nevertheless, all the ploys of American diplomacy were unable to hoodwink the progressive world public, which anxiously followed the developments in Korea.

¹ The Soviet representative at the Security Council abstained from its sessions from January 13 and up to August 1, 1950, in protest against the refusal by the Western countries to replace the representative of the Chiang Kaishek clique at the Security Council by a legitimate representative of the People's Republic of China.—*Ed.*

The invasion of Korea dramatically exacerbated the international situation and could have led to a third world war. President Truman is known to make a threat on November 30, 1950, to use atomic weapons in Korea. It transpired from the documents made public later that General MacArthur suggested that ... 30-50 atomic bombs should be dropped on that Asian country. At the same time the American general deemed it expedient to create a zone contaminated with radioactive cobalt stretching from the Sea of Japan to the Yellow Sea. Truman confirmed later on that at that time, when the whole world was full of anxiety, MacArthur was ready to risk a "total war".

General MacArthur was not alone: he reflected the views of the bosses of the American military-industrial complex, who sought to kindle a big "preventive war" out of the Korean events. They did not succeed that time. The extremist plan was turned down after long debates in Washington's ruling quarters, largely due to the military potential and political prestige of the Soviet Union. In his memoirs Truman wrote that the main reason for rejecting the plan proposed by General MacArthur and his supporters was the fear that the Soviet Union might enter the war. It even caused the relief of the commander-in-chief from his post. It is also a historically known fact that fraternal socialist countries helped the Democratic People's Republic of Korea enormously in repelling the American aggressors.

The escalation of the war was precluded, and

American imperialism failed to attain the goals it had set itself when unleashing the Korean war.

"DAY X" FOR THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

When the counter-revolutionary coup had suffered a fiasco in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, the imperialists attempted another counter-revolutionary offensive against the socialist system in the German Democratic Republic. The signal was given on June 17, 1953.

CIA head Allen Dulles himself supervised from West Berlin the activities of subversive radio stations and a host of agents in the German Democratic Republic, whose task was to organise demonstrations and strikes. A pre-planned scenario envisaged "spontaneous" disturbances, street fighting and even blood-letting. The next stage was an invasion by American and West German armed forces which had been put on the alert. Intervention spelt occupation.

They chose the time when the German Democratic Republic was going through serious political and economic difficulties. The setting up of agricultural cooperatives and measures taken against the urban bourgeoisie had sharpened class struggle. Besides, for certain reasons foodstuffs and consumer goods were supplied to the population irregularly during the first half of 1953. Shortcomings were also observed in small commodity production. Those temporal difficulties in building

socialism in the German Democratic Republic and the exceptionally strong pressure exercised by imperialist reaction from without stimulated activity of former Nazis and other counter-revolutionary elements and resulted in discontent above all among the petty-bourgeois strata of the population. The leaders of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic passed resolutions on June 9 and 11 to do away with miscalculations and to improve the situation in the country, initiating the "new policy course".

To prevent the implementation of these measures, imperialist reaction speeded up its preparations for the long-planned counter-revolutionary putsch. Its aim was to absorb the German Democratic Republic into West Germany under the threat of a military intervention by Western powers.

On June 14, 1953, Adenauer, who was well advanced in age, demanded that all borders between the German Democratic Republic and West Germany be eliminated. All the subversive organisations hostile to the German Democratic Republic and imperialist secret services were brought into action. Special envoy of the US Department of State on the "Berlin problem" Eleona Dulles, General Ridgway, notorious for his ruthlessness in Korea, and officials close to the West German Chancellor came to West Berlin to direct the developments on the spot.

Simultaneously American war planes airlifted commandos from the semi-military "Forschungs-

beirat" to West Berlin, West German border units were put on the alert, and American tanks in Bavaria took up positions at the state border of the German Democratic Republic.

On June 17, 1953, imperialist secret agents and fascist provocateurs succeeded in persuading the workers at a number of enterprises in Berlin and some other cities of the German Democratic Republic to stop work and hold demonstrations. Groups of provocateurs tried to steer workers' actions and to provoke disturbances and armed clashes. The Rias radio station based in the American sector of West Berlin called for a "general strike" and transmitted coded instructions for the putsch. Gangs of criminals and hirelings burst into government departments, party committees and shops, destroying the equipment, setting fire to and desecrating the emblems of the German Democratic Republic and the workers' movement. Conscious workers who came out against the putschists, were beaten and taunted. Imperialist agents tried to do everything in their power to provoke violence, which would serve as a pretext for the military intervention by Western powers.

But already the next day it became clear that the counter-revolutionary putsch fell through. The deluded working people realised that the organisers of the putsch were not seeking ways to overcome the existing difficulties and eliminate the shortcomings, but wanted to do away with the people's democratic government and to restore imperialist domination. Workers undertook to repel the fascist agents provocateurs, set up self-de-

fence brigades and, guided by the Party organisations of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, took charge of guarding the enterprises. The presence of Soviet troops stationed in the German Democratic Republic was also an important factor that helped to thwart the imperialist plans.

The conspirators suffered a fiasco. Guided by the working class party, the working people, the law enforcement bodies and the armed forces of the German Democratic Republic put an end to the fascist putsch. Several days later the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany held a plenary meeting, drawing the necessary conclusions from the events of June 17 and working out measures to strengthen people's democracy. The document adopted by the plenary meeting pointed out that it took several hours to frustrate the hopes of the initiators of the adventurist plan to persuade the working class to eliminate their own state system.

HUNGARIAN PUTSCH

Defeats in Czechoslovakia (1948) and the German Democratic Republic (1953) led the reactionaries to the conclusion that another counter-revolution had to be better planned and thoroughly prepared. In 1956 imperialism focused its "attention" on Hungary.

Characteristically enough, Washington's ruling elite did not even try to conceal American involvement in preparations for this essentially fascist counter-revolution. Allen Dulles admitted at a

meeting of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee that American government officers knew in advance that a plot was in the making and, what was more, helped to organise it. John Foster Dulles, Allen's brother and the then Secretary of State, speaking in Texas on October 27, four days after the rising broke out in Hungary, bluntly urged the replacement of the existing Hungarian government. Furthermore, the American Administration offered the putschists material aid to the tune of 20 million dollars.

The putsch relied on the representatives of the ousted classes of landlords and capitalists, petty-bourgeois elements which had joined them, and also the remnants of the Horthy men and reactionary officers who had been expelled from Hungary and found refuge in the West. In this way international reaction teamed up with domestic counter-revolution to oppose the people's democratic system.

Imre Nagy, revisionist and traitor who had wormed his way to the top, became an obedient tool for carrying through the criminal imperialist plans. Shortly before the putsch he cobbled together an illegal group of conspirators which engaged in clandestine preparations for the overthrow of the people's democratic system. As head of the Hungarian government, he suggested that Soviet troops should withdraw from Budapest and then ordered Hungarian troops to stop military operations against the mutineers. The counter-revolutionaries were given a free hand and launched an offensive.

Imre Nagy became the head of the Hungarian government on October 24, 1956, and already on the next day he and his accomplices started implementing the long-thought-out plan of severing Hungary from the fraternal socialist countries in a bid to proclaim the "neutrality" of Hungary. When the Hungarian working people foiled that perfidious plan Imre Nagy appealed to the imperialist states to give armed support for the counter-revolution. It is easy to understand that interference by Western powers in the domestic affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic would have posed a direct threat to the security of the European socialist countries and created a new seat of military danger on the continent.

Counter-revolutionary activities were coordinated by US-controlled Radio Free Europe, which practically turned into the counter-revolutionary headquarters. Its broadcasts prepared by CIA experts contained detailed instructions as to how to make bandit raids on the government and public institutions and to finish off the advocates of the democratic system. On October 31 it provocatively urged Hungary to renounce the Warsaw Treaty.

It is enough to collate Radio Free Europe calls with the mutineers' actions to dispel all doubts about the close coordination of activities by domestic counter-revolution and world reaction!

Encouraged by support from abroad, the mutineers launched mass massacres of Communists, public figures and politicians defending people's democracy. The blood of loyal sons of the Hunga-

rian people was spilt on Budapest streets. On Nagy's instructions state borders were opened and a flow of former associates of Horthy and Szalási¹—frank fascists, former owners of factories and plants and all sorts of rabble—rushed into the country, eager to settle a score with the popular government.

... A look at the old photographs and newspapers made my blood curdle: they show lacerated and mutilated corpses, gallows with the victims hanging heads down, piles of severed arms, legs, heads, pieces of torn-away skin, disfigured bodies with gory stars cut on backs, chests, stomachs... This bloody orgy was described by the *Szabadnép* newspaper, the organ of the Nagy "government", as a "popular and democratic uprising". Cardinal Mindszenty, arch-reactionary Catholic prelate with the ideas of the Great Inquisition period who was solemnly invited by the "new government" to take the post of archbishop, in his radio address described the ground swell of terror as a "cultural-nationalistic regime".

Even the Western press deemed it necessary to mention the "excesses" of the counter-revolutionary putsch. For example, British *Daily Telegraph* wrote that violence was reigning in Budapest. *Reynolds News* published in London reported that Hungarian fascists were rushing to Hungary from abroad... The France Presse Agency informed

¹ Szalási, the leader of the Hungarian fascists, headed the Hungarian government in 1944-1945 on the Hungarian territory still under Nazi occupation; sentenced to death in 1946.—*Ed.*

on October 31 that Hungary was witnessing another "Horthy putsch of 1919". A similar conclusion was made by Reuter, which reported on October 31 that people were hunted in Budapest streets and that the country saw scenes reminiscent of the return of the Whites in 1919...

That was the situation in Hungary in late October and early November 1956 when the counter-revolution encroached upon the historic accomplishments of the Hungarian working class and all the working people made in the ten years of the existence of people's democracy. The socialist future of that country was at stake.

However, the Hungarian working class found strength to save its homeland. A new revolutionary workers' and peasants' government headed by János Kádár was formed on November 3. It proclaimed that its immediate tasks were to put an end to the fratricidal war, to disarm the counter-revolutionary gangs, to defend the socialist homeland and to ensure Hungary's national independence. The government asked the Soviet Union to help it oppose the counter-revolution. Guided by the desire to maintain peace and security in Europe and proceeding from the principles of socialist internationalism, the Soviet government met that request and resolutely came out against the imperialist export of counter-revolution. Soviet troops helped the Hungarian armed forces to restore peace and order in that country.

Mass meetings and demonstrations were held in Budapest on November 6. The participants marched in columns, carrying red banners and na-

tional flags and singing the Internationale and the Marseillaise. Common workers, the salt of the Earth, chanted: "Down with anarchy!", "We want to work!", "No to fascism!", "Long live the Kádár government!".

The hopes of the imperialists to export counter-revolution to the Hungarian People's Republic were frustrated.

"DIRTY" VIETNAM WAR

Following the Second World War, South-East Asia, and especially Indochina, saw impressive revolutionary transformations. During the war Indochina, the former French colony, was occupied by the Japanese. But already then, influential political forces operated in the region, organising guerilla war against the occupation troops. A powerful national liberation movement emerged. The victory of the people's democratic revolution on September 2, 1945, resulted in the proclamation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the first state in South-East Asia to be run by the working people and based on an alliance of workers and peasants. That was an event of great historic importance.

Needless to say, it was not to the liking of the former colonialists as an armed aggression by the French against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam confirmed. A recent member of the anti-Hitler coalition, France launched a large-scale colonialist venture against a nation that had just freed itself from occupation. The 400,000-strong

army of colonialists had been engaged for more than eight years in a war which came to be called "dirty war"; it ended in 1954, with French troops defeated in the battle of Dienbienphu.

During the Geneva Conference on Indochina, the American Administration came out against the peaceful settlement and incited France to continue the war. The United States boosted arms supplies to France and pledged to give additional aid to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. Regarding Indochina as an important strategic base and a source of raw materials, the United States was ready to participate directly in military operations up to using atomic weapons.

In France, however, the expensive "dirty Vietnam war" was of little popularity and evoked broad discontent among the population, bringing about the downfall of the government that was bent on continuing it. France agreed to sign an agreement on cease-fire in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. In keeping with that agreement, the zones created in Vietnam (the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and South Vietnam) were not to enter any military alliance or create any foreign bases on their territory.

After the French colonialists were defeated and withdrew, the United States hurried to fill the "vacuum" in a bid to turn South Vietnam into a base of struggle against the national liberation movement in South-East Asia. Looks like another attempt to export counter-revolution, doesn't it?

The American imperialists did their utmost to prevent a political settlement between South and

North Vietnam, to say nothing of their reunification. They also frustrated general elections envisioned by the Geneva Conference on Indochina. A clique of generals and officials, which had entrenched themselves in Saigon and sold their services to their American patrons, quelled the liberation movement by the people of South Vietnam with fire and sword. Mass terror was directed above all against the participants in the Resistance and the anti-colonial war, against all those who struggled for independent development and the peaceful reunification of the two parts of the country.

Already in 1955 the US flagrantly violated the Geneva agreement by sending thousands of its military advisers and experts to South Vietnam. President Kennedy sent 15,000 servicemen there in 1961 in order, to quote him, to support the struggle against "communist terrorism". After staging an incident at the coast of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in August 1964, the US Administration passed through the Congress the so-called Tonkin resolution, sanctioning military operations against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Soon the number of American "advisers and experts" in Vietnam rose to 40,000 and by 1965 it amounted to 80,000, reaching 525,000 in 1967. By early 1969 that war of piracy involved, apart from Saigon troops armed by the Americans, more than 550,000 American soldiers as well as the US Seventh Fleet consisting of 200 war-ships with 80,000 servicemen on board.

August 1964 was the beginning of the barbar-

ous bombing of Vietnam, the landing of the marines and large-scale military operations involving up-to-date materiel. The United States dropped in Indochina—Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia—760,000 tons of bombs, that is, by 250 per cent more bombs than it used in that region in the course of the entire Second World War. Chemical weapons were also used on a mass scale. Seventy-one million litres of defoliants were showered over the territory of South Vietnam; napalm, gases and shrapnel and pellet bombs were also employed against the civilian population.

In 1968, representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States started talks in Paris. They ended on January 27, 1973, with the signing of the Paris accords, in keeping with which the United States pulled its troops out of South Vietnam.

That war cost the American tax payers a colossal sum of 150,000 million dollars and took the toll of 50,000 young Americans. Captain Edward Miles of the US army who had lost both legs, an eye and an arm in the tropical jungle during that war, said: "I am asking myself whether it all was worth our lives... If I could have gone there now I would have fought on the Vietnamese side. These people know what they are fighting for."

Neither terror, massacres, tortures, tiger traps used against people, hamlets turned into concentration camps, nor the decimation of entire settlements helped the United States. The biggest imperialist power in the long run capitulated to the

freedom-loving nation that had been fighting courageously for decades against three aggressors—first the Japanese militarists, then the French colonialists and, finally, the American imperialists. The people stood heroically to the very end and won because they were guided by Ho Chi Minh's maxim, which they never forgot: "There is nothing more valuable than independence and freedom." On a clear morning of April 30, 1975, a banner bearing a gold star was hoisted over Saigon (now Ho Chi Minh City). That meant that the whole of South Vietnam was under the control by the patriotic forces. The remnants of American units accompanied by 60,000 of their accomplices were hastily boarding planes, helicopters and ships. The Vietnamese people's army opened the doors of prisons, setting free 200,000 political prisoners . . . The counter-revolutionary attempt to impose upon the Vietnamese people a regime copying an American model failed.

MASSACRES IN INDONESIA

Indonesia with the population of about 150 million is one of the largest South-East Asian states abounding in natural resources. It annually extracts more than 80 million tons of oil and is the region's biggest supplier of power raw materials. It also figures among the world's biggest exporters of gas. The country possesses vast reserves of tin, manganese, lead, chromium, zinc, copper, bauxites and nickel. It exports natural rubber, rice, coffee, and tropical timber.

Indonesia had always attracted lovers of easy profit. For three centuries and a half it was a Dutch colony. During the Second World War the country was occupied by the Japanese.

The news of the defeat of the Japanese militarists in the Far East stirred the Indonesian people, and in August 1945 they rose against the enslavers, proclaiming the establishment of the Republic of Indonesia.

Since the early days of their independence, the Indonesian people had to face considerable difficulties in organising the institutes of power and defending the republic from outside enemies. In August 1945, when the revolution was at its height, a provisional constitution, which had been worked out in the period of the struggle against the Japanese invaders, was put into force, parliament was convened and President (Sukarno) elected. Soon afterwards the government announced the nationalisation of many foreign enterprises, plantations and banks. When the first detachments of British troops landed on Java on September 29, 1945, they found themselves in a normally operating state.

The Dutch colonialists came in the wake of the British army. To begin with, British and Dutch troops attempted to restore colonialist practices in Indonesia. They staged one provocation after another, seizing towns and preparing for a bigger operation. On November 10, 1945, supported by the remaining Japanese units, they stormed the town of Surabaya. Its population heroically defended the town, and the united imperialist for-

cès were defeated. The republic started to mark November 10 as Heroes' Day in honour of the victory.

However, even after the Surabaja defeat the Dutch colonialists, supported by the US ruling elite, persisted in their attempts to overthrow the legitimate government of the Republic of Indonesia. Those attempts were a component of the American policy of turning the whole of South-East Asia into a sphere of American influence.

The colonialists organised anti-governmental plots, acts of terrorism, subversion and sabotage and also resorted to political, economic and military pressure. They counted on Indonesia's domestic counter-revolutionary forces—feudal landowners, the comprador bourgeoisie and the reactionary parties and cliques upholding their interests. American diplomats in Jakarta openly interfered in the internal affairs of the republic, encouraging all sorts of renegades. For example, when in late 1957 one of them, colonel Simbolon, managed to seize power on Northern Sumatra, the American ambassador declared that the American Administration intended to recognise *de facto* the rebellious colonel's regime. The United States aided the separatists, supplying them with weapons and ammunition from its military bases.

Despite the diverse aid given by the imperialists, the counter-revolutionary uprising did not last long in Indonesia: the mutineers were defeated by the people.

The Sukarno government adopted a policy of doing away with the vestiges of colonialism and

drawing closer together with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Sukarno was one of the founders of the non-alignment movement. He actively participated in the conference of 29 Asian and African states, which was held in Bandung (Indonesia) in 1955 and which, guided by the Pancha Shila principles of peaceful coexistence, played an important role in lessening international tensions, enhancing the anti-imperialist thrust of the developing countries' policy and boosting their struggle to put an end to colonialism and neocolonialism.

Imperialist agents never stopped their subversive activities against the progressive regime of the Republic of Indonesia. Its government had to struggle for a long time to re-unite Western Irian, the western part of the island of New Guinea, with the republic. It was no easy task to overcome the resistance mounted by the Netherlands, which stubbornly refused to transfer its remaining colonial possessions in Indonesia to the Indonesian people. The Netherlands were backed by the American and British imperialists interested in the local uranium mines and in using Western Irian as a military base. It was not until 1962 that, following talks with UN participation, Western Irian was returned to Indonesia.

But the republic was too valuable for the reactionaries to let it go easily. In autumn 1965, a CIA-aided counter-revolutionary coup took place in the country. It dealt the main blow at the Communist party, which fell victim to mass physical extermination—hundreds of thousands of Indo-

nesian Communists perished in bloody massacres. Apart from the Communist party, other progressive public and left-wing nationalistic organisations were crushed and banned, the dissemination of left-wing publications was forbidden, etc.

That time the export of counter-revolution bore fruit.

ABORTIVE ATTEMPT TO TAKE REVENGE

The hot summer of 1968 in Czechoslovakia is already a thing of the past, yet many people throughout the globe are still keenly interested in those events. This interest is largely explained by the fact that a considerable portion of the world public found itself deceived by those who, under the pretext of "improving" socialism and making it "humane", attempted to turn socialist Czechoslovakia into a proving ground to test political, economic, ideological and even military means of combating people's democracies and world socialism.

In those days newspapers and magazines on all the continents brimmed with sensational reports from Czechoslovakia. The impression they produced in many countries was that of an explosion. Any "sensation", however, has its prehistory. Events in Czechoslovakia should be traced not only back to the inner political situation obtaining by spring 1968 but further back into history. When the heroic working class of Czechoslovakia headed by the Communists steered

its country along the road of socialism in February 1948, world reaction could not reconcile itself with the loss of such an important position in the centre of Europe. US Secretary of State John Forster Dulles, one of the cold war strategists, kept repeating at that time that the West should bring Czechoslovakia back to its bosom along with other countries which had found themselves in the Soviet orbit.

To accomplish their flagrant attempt at exporting counter-revolution, the reactionaries brought into play all the means they had at their disposal. Their actions were scrupulously coordinated—rallies of Sudeten Germans coincided with visits to Prague by West European financiers; Western powers' demagoguery at the UN was echoed by the hysterical excesses of the "long-haired" youths at Stare Mesto and Vaclav Square, the spread of underground radio stations, printing shops and arms caches prepared in advance all over the country was bolstered by counter-revolutionary leaflets and newspapers, which seemed to be coming to Czechoslovakia as if out of the blue. In their "programmatic" pronouncements the leaders and ideologists of the internal anti-socialist forces had been brainwashing the Czechoslovak people with slander and insinuations for months on end. Some irresponsible officials, like General Prchlík, in their anti-socialist zeal did not hesitate to reveal military secrets of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation to the enemy.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia thoroughly analysed those events in the well-known doc-

ument under the heading "Lessons of the Crisis in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and in Society After the 13th Congress of the CPCz". It has shown how the remnants of the bourgeoisie, long compromised and overthrown, and the petty-bourgeois strata of the population, together with the revisionists and right-wing opportunists in the Communist Party leadership, attempted twenty years after the February 1948 triumph to carry out a counter-revolutionary coup, determined to take revenge for their February 1948 defeat and to restore capitalism.

Czechoslovakia's road to socialism was a thorny one. Reality repeatedly confirmed Klement Gottwald's sagacious comment that there were no asphalt roads to socialism. Apart from the worsening international situation and subversive activities by internal enemies, difficulties arose because people still held some backward ideas of the past and the country's swift economic development engendered new management problems. Subjectivist mistakes also accumulated, as right-wing opportunistic views of running the economy and society gained ground. At the same time, the party weakened its ideological work, ignoring the need to oppose the spread of ideas alien to Marxism. Philistinism, careerism and time-serving conformity flourished. Few seemed to remember Klement Gottwald's warning that the class enemy is always on the alert and one should constantly bear in mind that it would try again and again to penetrate into the Party, to influence its policy and to lead it astray from the correct road.

Use was made of distortions of reality, semi-truths and high-sounding promises to conceal genuine intentions. For example, criticism of shortcomings in the economy and its management became a subject of political wheeling and dealing. The right-wing opportunist and anti-socialist forces almost single-handedly supervised the mass media. Ota Šik's experiments were leading to the gradual substitution of "market economy" and "workers' self-management" for centralised guidance and planning and to the weakening and subsequent elimination of the socialist ownership of the means of production and, eventually, to the restoration of capitalism.

Across the Czechoslovak border international reaction was preparing to whip up psychological warfare against the socialist community as a whole and the accomplishments of people's democracy in Czechoslovakia in particular. The 1957 NATO conference in London resolved to improve the work of the mass media and intensify psychological warfare. The next similar conference held in 1959 deemed it necessary to set up a new NATO department to render corresponding aid to the allied countries and to act as the headquarters of ideological warfare. In June 1968, Reykjavik hosted the notorious NATO Council session which discussed political developments in Czechoslovakia. The foreign ministers attending it spoke highly of the activities of the Czechoslovak "reformers" and pointed out that "differentiation" was taking place in the East and had to be supported.

Psychological warfare was accompanied by war

preparations preceded by intensive intelligence activity. Czechoslovakia was flooded by Western secret agents disguised as tourists and journalists. More than 300 correspondents of Western mass media came to Prague.

Joint efforts by external and internal reaction created the situation which brought the country to the verge of fratricidal war. That was why the internationalist aid by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty allies of Czechoslovakia was called for in order to foil the plans of exporting counter-revolution and to preclude bloodshed. This step was necessary and had no alternative.

The attempt by reaction to take revenge for its 1948 defeat and to have "counter-February of 1968" in Czechoslovakia was thwarted.

TODAY'S REALITY

HATRED OF THE SAUR REVOLUTION

In the late 1970s the exporters of counter-revolution fastened their attention on Afghanistan.

Already in February 1919, this backward Asian state proclaimed itself independent, defying imperialist Britain, which used fettering agreements concluded in the late 19th century to exercise control over Afghan economy and politics. The Great October Socialist Revolution provided the decisive impulse to the liberation movement of the Afghan people. The young Soviet republic was the first country to recognise Afghanistan's independence on March 27, 1919, and to establish diplomatic relations with it on May 27 of the same year.

Britain reacted to Afghanistan's independence in a different way, namely, it unleashed a war against it. The Afghan people resolutely rebuffed the colonialists, who had to go back home and to sign a peace treaty ratified by the Afghan side on August 19, 1919. The country had to see the Saur Revolution of 1978, however, to make August 19 the Day of the Restoration of Independence in Afghanistan.

The 1978 revolution was headed and carried out by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the party of the working class and the country's

entire working people. The new government undertook sweeping social and economic reforms in the interests of the working people and proclaimed the policy of non-alignment and good-neighbourly relations with all the countries in the region, as far as its foreign policy was concerned. Measures to eradicate feudal and pre-feudal relations and to democratise social life were introduced in extremely complicated circumstances and met with fierce resistance by the feudal and other classes doomed by history.

As might have been expected, the Afghan feudal lords perceived lethal danger in the revolution and responded to it with sabotage, subversion and the organisation of *dushman* gangs in order to intimidate the population through plunder, arson and killings. The internal reactionary forces found support from international imperialism. The complicated situation in the country was aggravated by the policy pursued by Amin, who in September 1979 ousted and physically destroyed the legitimate leader of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the Afghan state, Nur Mohammed Taraki, usurped power and unleashed a campaign of terror and oppression in the country. Thousands of innocent people—party activists and non-party working people—were killed or imprisoned on his order.

American interference in Afghanistan was one of the main causes of the crisis situation in that country in late 1979. Departure from the socialist principles and excesses committed by Amin and his clique served only as the general back-

drop for US increasing interference in the Afghan affairs by supplying counter-revolutionary gangs with weapons and money. About 30 special bases and 50 camps to train gangs for incursions into Afghanistan were set up on the territory of Pakistan, where the CIA moved its regional headquarters from Iran after the downfall of the Shah regime. The American Administration tried to mask its activities by posing as "peace-makers", who are "tolerant" to the revolutionary changes in Afghanistan. The Americans were exposed by their own friend and ally—the then Egyptian President, Anwar Sadat. In September 1981, in his NBC interview he was unexpectedly frank and disclosed some facts that Washington took great pains to conceal. He said that as soon as struggle erupted in Afghanistan, the United States contacted him for arms supplies to the Afghans on American planes from Cairo. He went on to say that the supplies were airlifted non-stop and would continue in the future.

It was the democratic nature of the Saur Revolution that predetermined American hostility towards it. Manipulating the counter-revolutionary forces inside Afghanistan, the US ruling elite artfully whipped up tensions, creating a crisis situation in the whole of the region. It is known that on February 14, 1979, agents provocateurs assassinated Adolph Dubbs, American ambassador in Kabul. Though the Afghan government expressed its sincere regret and denounced the crime, the American press launched a vicious anti-Afghan campaign. The White House responded by stag-

ing subversive activities and creating real danger to the revolutionary accomplishments and the security of the Afghan people. That was how the undeclared war against Afghanistan started. Together with the discrediting and undermining of the social and economic reforms in the country by Amin's clique, Washington's undeclared war was responsible for the crisis situation in Afghanistan.

New, healthy elements within the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the Afghan army undertook to offset the danger threatening the revolution. On December 27, 1979, the Amin regime was ousted, and Babrak Karmal became the head of the new government. In response to repeated requests from the Afghan government, the Soviet Union performed its internationalist duty and brought a limited contingent of its troops to Afghanistan to help the Afghan people repel the armed aggression from without. The act fully accorded with Article 51 of the UN Charter and Article 4 of the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighbourliness and Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan signed in December 1978.

World counter-revolutionary schemes were frustrated, and Afghanistan's integrity and independence preserved.

The West launched a hysterical anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan campaign, which did not stop at sheer rhetoric. In March 1981, President Reagan spoke about expanding aid to the Afghan counter-revolutionaries. On the other hand, American aid to the government of the Democratic Republic

of Afghanistan, so much publicised by the United States in the effort to prove its "indifference" to the political implications of the events in the country, was stopped in early 1980.

The Afghan revolution took place at the will of the working people and in their interests. It has set itself general democratic and national tasks, among them the elimination of big landownership and the distribution of land among the poorer peasants, the development of a truly national economy, the raising of the people's living standards, the development of education and national culture, the shedding of feudal heritage, and the introduction of the basic elements of political democracy. All this meets the aspirations of the broad sections of the population and therefore evokes rage and hatred among the feudal notables, the reactionary clergy and international imperialism, which pins hopes on the export of counter-revolution. They look like futile hopes, however!

THE WEST LOOKS FOR A "WEAK LINK"

In the late 1970s the Carter Administration, on the initiative of presidential adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, started a big demagogic "human rights" campaign directed against the socialist countries. In Czechoslovakia, a group of dissidents, hapless politicians with anti-socialist leanings, actively joined this propaganda hullabaloo by issuing the so-called Charter-77 in 1977. The bankrupts of 1968 expatiated on "human rights", in fact meaning the

“right” of counter-revolutionary elements to subversive activity against the socialist state.

It is only natural that Charter-77 met with no support in Czechoslovakia and the campaign around it failed in the West.

Another anti-communist crusade under the slogan of the “defence of human rights” was staged to CIA precepts against Poland. It was inspired by none other than Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is of Polish extraction and speaks English with an accent. For a number of years he was formulating and guiding American foreign policy towards the socialist countries and Poland in particular. Like other political scientists in the West, he believed that Poland was a “weak link” in the chain of the world socialist system. Let it be recalled that John Foster Dulles, who preached the policy “from strength”, promised to return Poland to the bosom of the West already in 1949. (He intended to do the same with Czechoslovakia as well!). Proceeding from the “theoretical estimates” made during the early post-war years, American secret services chose Poland as the main link in their plans of disintegrating from within people’s democracies and undermining the socialist community.

The Western powers’ policy towards the socialist countries should be viewed in the context of the general struggle between capitalism and socialism on the world scene. Reality repeatedly corroborates Lenin’s conclusion that “transition from capitalism to communism is an entire historical epoch” and that; “Until this epoch is over, the

exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this *hope* turns into *attempts* at restoration."¹

These attempts form part of the general strategy of capitalism against socialism. To implement it, the imperialist states have over-inflated organisations directly engaged in subversive activities, including in the field of propaganda. The large-scale propaganda campaign against socialist Poland and undisguised interference in its domestic affairs are nothing new in this sense. Plans of exploiting the internal situation in Poland to combat socialism have been afoot for many years now.

When the Second World War was over, Poland experienced grave difficulties: it had to heal the deep wounds inflicted to its economy by Nazism. The needs of the rehabilitation period made it impossible to allocate sufficient money to raise the people's living standards. Besides, the country's state and party officials made some subjectivist mistakes in the building of a new society. The enemies of socialist Poland did not hesitate to use them in stepping up their opposition to people's democracy.

In the period preceding the events of 1980-1981 "human rights champions" calumniated in every way the accomplishments made by People's Poland in the less than four decades of its existence. According to them, all those years, the Communists had been ruining the economy and destroying national traditions and Polish culture! The condi-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 254.

tions in which Poland found itself before embarking upon the road of socialist transformation were consciously passed by in silence. But how can one forget that as a result of the Second World War and the Nazi occupation Poland lost 40 per cent of its national wealth, with 70 per cent of its factories and plants lying in ruins? The country had lost more than 6 million of its citizens (22 per cent of its population) and more than 500,000 Poles remained incapacitated for life. The desperate struggle mounted by the overthrown classes against the social changes evolved into a civil war which took the toll of 50,000 human lives.

Below are some facts showing the accomplishments made by People's Poland in 36 years of its development. By 1980 it accounted for approximately 2.5 per cent of world industrial production (1.3 per cent in 1938), with its population amounting to 0.8 per cent of that of the world. By this indicator alone the country ranks among the world's ten most industrially developed countries. Its housing construction has seen an 11-fold increase over the pre-war level. Real incomes of the population expressed in money terms were 250 per cent higher than in 1937. Meat consumption per head of the population in the 1970s exceeded 70 kilograms, while before the war it stood at about 20 kilograms a year. Today's Poland has long outstripped pre-war Poland. Could all this have been achieved without the bulk of the population supporting the ideas of socialism or without the release of the people's creative forces?

The internal anti-socialist opposition and its

patrons abroad viewed the situation differently; for them, the events in Poland in 1980-1981 were a result of the "crisis" of the socialist system and the socialist model of development. In this way the real state of affairs was replaced by a spurious propaganda ploy aimed at implementing and justifying the dismantling of socialism in Poland under the slogan of improving and replacing it by a "new and truly just system".

In fact, the difficulties which had accumulated by 1980 could have been surmounted. Noteworthy in this respect is the opinion expressed by a *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* analyst, who wrote on August 18, 1980, about the economic situation in Poland: "Had Warsaw been able to continue for two more years its current export and import policy, it would have in the main coped with its problems." It was at that moment that external and internal counter-revolution dealt it a blow, causing an acute crisis in the country.

Experience teaches us that the class enemy knows how to use the slightest oversight on our part in order to, so to speak, first thrust a stick into the door, then a leg, and then to squeeze the whole of its brazen self. This is what, to my mind, happened in Gdansk in the summer of 1980, when a wave of strikes led to the official recognition of the so-called "independent" trade unions—the Solidarity. This legalisation enabled the reactionary forces to engage in overt political struggle against the Polish United Workers' Party and People's Poland with the aim of usurping power and eliminating the socialist system.

The Polish counter-revolutionaries were spear-headed at that time by the grouping called Public Self-Defence Committee (formerly called Workers' Defence Committee, KOR). The establishment of the latter was sanctioned by Western secret services in the autumn 1975 when renegades from socialist countries assembled in Geneva. Their patrons across the ocean promised generous aid in money and subversive materials. The organisation came into existence in the autumn of 1976 and Adam Michnik, one of its leaders, defined its role as that of "a pistol put to the authorities' head".

The idea to form the so-called "free trade unions" in Poland also came from abroad and was financed in dollars. February 1978 saw the proclamation of the Free Trade Union Committee in Katowice on the initiative of the Public Self-Defence Committee leaders, and in April 1978 a Commission of the Free Trade Unions of the Coast, the predecessor of the Solidarity, was formed. Quite a few of the workers' defence committee activists were sent as "experts" to the "independent" trade unions.

A book *Whither Poland* was published in Luxembourg in many languages, including Czech. Its author produced an indepth analysis of the Solidarity and the counter-revolutionary methods it uses to oppose socialism. Among other things, he wrote that thanks to the efforts by the Workers' Defence Committee "experts" and influential Catholic leaders, Solidarity started to exercise certain influence upon Polish society, though it lacked any constructive social programme. Its ag-

gressiveness increasingly evolved into psychological violence. The activities of Solidarity "experts" bore an imprint of the influence of some groups and even concrete figures among the Polish émigrés in the West, who have thrown their lot with imperialist secret and intelligence services.

In this way, the Polish events laid bare the aspirations of world imperialism and above all American imperialism and those of the Catholic Church as represented by the Vatican and its apparatus.

A year after the formation of the Solidarity the counter-revolutionary forces rallied under its banner brought Poland to the brink of political and economic chaos.

The Gdansk Congress of the Solidarity raised the problem of Poland's withdrawal from the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and also of revising its agreements and foreign-policy commitments. A detailed scenario was prepared for the forcible seizure of power. All this, together with the so-called Appeal to the Peoples of Eastern Europe, which called on the peoples of other socialist countries to follow the example of the Solidarity, attested to the fact that this organisation was an instrument of Western subversive centres hoping to carry through a counter-revolutionary coup first in Poland and then in other socialist countries. It was for this reason that the Solidarity received exceptionally generous aid from abroad.

Some people in the West still believe that the Polish events were the result of internal ferment

and that all talk about interference from without is sheer propaganda. However, we are getting fresh evidence that there existed a conspiracy against Poland and an operation was long in the making to destabilise the situation in that country. For example, *Tiempo* published in Spain wrote about a secret plan worked out by none other than Brzezinski and presented to the American President on March 17, 1978. This curious document dispelled all doubts about the true nature of events which brought about the 1980-1981 crisis in Poland.

In the 1980s, Brzezinski predicted, Poland would be spending 90 per cent of its export earnings to repay its debts, which by 1980 would reach 20 billion dollars. His conclusion was that this circumstance would become a suitable moment for further steps to be taken to implement the plan of actions. In this connection he said that the United States should be ready for any upheavals and changes in Europe.

The Spanish magazine reminded its readers that there existed several variants of Poland's future state organisation, including the creation of a coalition government of moderate Communists, independent economists, opposition members and clerical representatives. Brzezinski also envisioned a possibility for a "rising" in Poland. Along with other means of undermining people's democracy, special role was to be played by the mass media. The plan read: "Propaganda should be focussed on the incompatibility of Poland's interests with the communist model. . . . We must do everything

in our power to encourage in Poland a pro-Western policy and economic orientation. We must direct our efforts at destabilising the situation in Poland.”¹

It is impossible to deny Brzezinski some “acumen”. Comparing his “forecasts” with the developments in Poland, we see that this plan was adopted by the American Administration. It became a scenario for the “trade union” counter-revolutionaries in their attempts to forcibly sever Poland from the socialist community. They miscalculated, though, because, regarding Poland as a “vulnerable link”, they were unable to understand the power and strength of the entire structure, of the whole of the socialist community, which is capable of defending its accomplishments from all, even the most perfidious counter-revolutionary plots.

* * *

I visited Poland the first time in 1948 and was then shaken by the colossal damage done to that country during the Second World War. With every subsequent visit I was impressed by something different—the enormous vitality of the Polish people, who have taken power in their hands. Beautiful cities have been raised from ruins; in the countryside orchards were in bloom and bore fruit. Children went to newly built schools. Polish film-makers have produced a host of remarkable

¹ *New Times*, No. 25, June 1983, pp. 18-19.

films and Polish literature has some very profound works.

When I think of that I have no doubts that the Polish people will find strength to overcome the present difficulties and that the patriotic forces of the country are capable of setting things right in their own home, maintaining and strengthening the cause of socialism in Poland and consolidating its international position as an inalienable part of the socialist community.

Counter-revolution has its advocates and patrons in the West but the Polish people, too, have their reliable friends!

ISRAEL, A BASE OF AGGRESSION

On November 29, 1947, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution on annulling the British mandate over Palestine, in this way envisioning the formation of two sovereign states—one for the Arabs and the other for the Jews. Jerusalem was to remain integral and indivisible, and to be placed under international control. Two-thirds of the UN member states, including the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and many other countries, supported the resolution and welcomed the just act of legalising national self-determination of the Jewish and the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. The UN proceeded from the right of both nations to independent existence and determined the boundaries of the future states in keeping with its position.

Already the next day the reactionary Zionist forces, which had been striving to form an independent Jewish state, stopped hiding the true meaning of their aggressive aspirations. Even before Israel officially proclaimed its statehood, armed Zionist gangs started fighting to establish control over the communications and towns with mixed population.

Throughout 1948-1949 the Israeli armed forces forcibly occupied the biggest part of the territory which, according to the UN General Assembly resolution, was to form the Palestinian Arab State. Already at that time about a million of Arabs were driven from their lawful lands in the name of implementing the Zionist idea of creating an Israeli empire from the Nile to the Euphrates. Arms were coming in an unending flow from the US, Canada, Britain and France, for the sake of translating into life the dream of "Greater Israel—the Promised Land". International Zionist organisations and leading capitalists of Jewish origin, such as Baron Rothschild, were helping the new state in every way. The Tel Aviv government was formed of the representatives of the most reactionary Zionist forces.

Nevertheless, the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples made the colonialists abandon their formerly firm positions in the Middle East, and the interests of the capitalist powers were gravely jeopardized. Under the circumstances the Israeli ruling elite assumed the role of a watchdog of the entire region, guarding voluntarily, though not without self-interest, the interests of

international, above all, American capital. Israel became a base for the implementation of all sorts of interventionist plans and a springboard for the export of counter-revolution.

The so-called "Suez crisis" of July 1956 fully demonstrated the aggressive essence of the state of Israel, disclosing the role assigned to it by the imperialist powers in the struggle against the national development of the Egyptian people.

There has hardly been a case of tensions in the Middle East in the 20th century which did not affect the interests of oil monopolies. Mid-Eastern supplies have always satisfied the bulk of the demand for oil in West European countries, which had no oil reserves of their own. For example, in 1956, Britain imported 80 per cent of the oil it needed from the Middle East, while the corresponding figure for France and Italy was 90 per cent. The overall sum of profits made by British and American companies from pumping out oil and exploiting the working people in the Middle East exceeded 3 billion dollars a year.

Sixty per cent of the oil produced in the region was transported through the Suez Canal.

The nationalisation of the Universal Suez Canal Maritime Company, which for many years had been a source of considerable profits for British and French stockholders, dealt a heavy blow at the interests of the imperialist powers. It was carried out by the new revolutionary government of Egypt headed by the remarkable leader of the Egyptian revolution, Gamal Abdel Nasser. That government was born of the anti-monarchic and anti-colonial

revolution. It is, therefore, easy to imagine the alarm and fear evoked among the imperialists by Nasser's statements to the effect that Egypt would follow the socialist road of development.

Western powers called the nationalisation of the Canal a "seizure". Apart from economic sanctions imposed by the British and French governments, war preparations were afoot, which meant that there were plans to seize the Suez Canal. The United States joined Britain and France in this venture, regarding the nationalisation of the Suez Canal as a threat to the interests of American oil companies which controlled 60 per cent of the entire oil extraction in the region.

With the knowledge and tacit approval of the American Administration, Israeli Prime Minister Ben-Gurion held a secret conference with the French and British Foreign Ministers on October 25, 1956, and reached an agreement on the co-ordination of military and political actions by the three countries against Egypt. Further events developed according to a plan agreed upon:

—in the early hours of October 30, Israeli army units started military operations against Egypt on the Sinai Peninsula and already on November 2 the whole of the Peninsula was occupied by the Israeli army;

—on October 31, British and French planes started bombing Cairo and other Egyptian cities and towns;

—on November 5, British and French troops started landing in Port Said.

But the British-French-Israeli aggression was

checked almost as soon as it started, thanks to the resolute interference by the Soviet Union. Its message to the governments of the United States, France, Britain and Israel of November 5, 1956, demanded that military operations be stopped and pointed out that the continuation of aggression might lead to dangerous consequences. As a result Britain announced withdrawal of its troops from Egypt already on November 6, and the French government made a similar statement on November 7.

That was the inglorious end of the imperialist "blitzkrieg" of 1956. But the ashes of war kept smouldering in the Middle East, where Israel, as before, remained a source of aggression, only changing its partners. American imperialism was firmly supplanting the British and the French.

The war unleashed by Israel on June 5, 1967, aimed not only at seizing Arab lands to create the "Greater Jewish state", but also at overthrowing the progressive regimes in Egypt and other countries in the region. It is quite obvious that, had it not been for the military, economic and political support from the biggest imperialist state in the world, Tel Aviv's ruling elite would never have been able to wage a large-scale war. That war showed that the US had fully pinned its hopes on Israel as its major ally and stronghold in the Middle East. By that time American imperialism had strengthened its position at the expense of the old colonial powers—Britain and France—and became "enemy No. 1" of the Arab liberation movement.

During the 1967 aggression Israel occupied large sectors of the territory belonging to the Arab Republic of Egypt (the Sinai Peninsula) and Syria (the Golan Heights), and also the West Bank of the Jordan, Eastern Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. All in all, the illegally occupied Arab territories amounted to 60,000 square kilometres, which is four times the area granted Israel by the UN resolution (!).

In those years American imperialism still tried to mask its involvement in the organisation and staging of acts of aggression, concealing preparations and agreements made in advance, whereas in 1981-1983 the collision between the Israeli aggressor and its American boss was an open secret from the outset. The Reagan Administration openly sided with the Israeli government and publicly vindicated the war of conquest unleashed by it. Furthermore, Habib, Reagan's special emissary in the Middle East, had the mission to reinforce the armed aggression with a diplomatic onslaught and to exert pressure on the Palestine Liberation Organisation, Lebanon and Syria in order to weaken their resistance to Israel.

* * *

When *Rudé právo*, the central organ of the CPCz Central Committee, published in 1967 a series of my articles about the reactionary nature of Zionism and exposed Israel as an aggressor, the right-wing revisionist "progressive intellectual coalition" still wielding considerable weight in

Czechoslovakia at that time accused us Communists of anti-Semitism. I am sorry to say, but some Czechoslovak men-of-letters and people in arts gave in to imperialist and Zionist propaganda. Anyone who retained the ability to think soberly about the war in the Middle East and who denounced the Israeli aggressor and supported its victim—the Arabs—was instantly branded as a dogmatist and conservative by those intellectuals.

Zionist propaganda called the 1967 war of aggression a “local national conflict”. The world public was supposed to believe that “weak” Israel was waging a defensive war confronted with the “danger of another genocide”.

The untenability of such claims is absolutely obvious, just as it is absolutely clear to any unbiased observer that the Israeli government’s daring stems from various support given to it by the Western imperialists. It is also an open secret that the powerful industrial potential of Israel was created thanks to billions invested, loaned and subsidised by world capitalism. Already in 1967, Israel was a prosperous enterprise, a branch of Western capital in the Middle East. Already then it was armed to the teeth with up-to-date American weapons, while the US Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, far from being a “defensive shield” for the “defenceless” Israelis, was directly involved in military operations and placed its electronic equipment and air reconnaissance at the disposal of the aggressor’s army.

It is only natural that the Israeli aggression was

denounced by all the socialist countries and the world communist movement, and the Israeli Communists headed by Vilner were quite right when they exposed the Zionist thesis about the Israeli aggression being nothing more than a local international conflict, in which Israel allegedly fought for its national liberation.

Reality shows that Israel pursues neo-colonialist policy in the interests of world imperialism, acting as an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" of the imperialist powers in the Middle East. Its main task is to watchfully guard the interests of oil monopolies against the threat posed by the developing Arab national liberation movement.

This role of Tel Aviv became fully manifest in the summer of 1982 when the Israeli *golem*¹ for the fifth time marched against a sovereign Arab state—this time Lebanon—under the pharisaic slogan of "Peace for Galilee!". The Israeli invasion of Lebanon again demonstrated the misanthropic essence of Zionism and its reactionary role on the political scene. The massacre staged by the Zionists in Sabra and Shatila dispelled the illusions of even those in the West who believed the Israeli propaganda myths about the "defensive nature" of the actions taken by the criminal ruling clique, and laid bare the terrible truth that genocide was one of the main methods used by Zionism to attain its political goals.

¹ *Golem*, in Jewish folk legends a clay giant brought to life by magic.—*Ed.*

The atrocities perpetrated by the aggressors in Lebanon bring to mind Nazi crimes during the Second World War. Seeking to destroy the Arab people of Palestine as a nation with the help of American imperialism, the Israeli ruling elite is not averse to any crime—to the point of starting a world conflagration.

The Israeli aggression in Lebanon was one of the most dangerous consequences of the Camp David accords between Egypt, Israel and the US. They brought into being a strategic alliance of international reaction directed against the national liberation movement in the Middle East with the aim of exporting counter-revolution to that region. There is no doubt that the criminal war against Lebanon unleashed by the Israeli Zionists gave a boost to the American imperialists' hegemonistic aspirations in the Middle East. The American President is known to have cynically declared that as a result of the Israeli actions in Lebanon the US received a chance to make far-reaching efforts to establish peace in the region. Needless to say, he meant peace American style.

The International Commission of Inquiry into Israeli Crimes against the Lebanese and Palestinian Peoples held its sessions in Nicosia (Cyprus) in August 1982 and heard evidence given by a vast number of eyewitnesses. Their evidence, the reports made by doctors and members of rescue teams who had worked in Palestinian refugee camps, the conclusions drawn by the Commission members who had visited Western Beirut and also journalists' accounts enabled the International

Commission to analyse the nature of crimes perpetrated in Lebanon. Its conclusion read:

"The State of Israel and its Zionist rulers are accused of the following criminal actions:

I—Crimes against peace;

II—Crimes against humanity;

III—War crimes;

IV—Actions designed to deny the Palestinian people the right to self-determination."

To strip a nation of the right to self-determination is nothing but the export of counter-revolution, the onslaught of world reaction, which in the form of Zionism is sowing war in the Middle East!

FIGHTING FOR A COLONY

In July 1982, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, on a visit to Washington, expressed profound gratitude to the American Administration for practical support in the British-Argentine armed conflict over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. The islands, as is known, were by force restored in the status of British colony.

The dispute over the Falklands has a long history. For four centuries they passed from one owner to another. In the early 19th century they formed a part of the United Provinces of La Plata (today's Argentina), which had freed themselves from Spanish rule. In 1833, the islands were recaptured by the British, who established control over the sea lane around Cape Horn. Argentina had never recognised that forcible occupation.

The dispute was transferred into the 20th cen-

tury. In the 1960s and the 1970s, the UN repeatedly called on the two sides to resolve the issue in conformity with the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (1960). But Britain turned a deaf ear to those calls.

In the early hours of April 2, 1982, Argentine commandos occupied the islands, dealing a great blow at the pride and vanity of British imperialism. For the first time since the Suez crisis of 1956 when the failure of the joint British-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt forced Conservative Prime Minister Anthony Eden to resign, the two Houses of Parliament convened an extraordinary session. The hall resounded with wild uproar. The cabinet found itself under a barrage of biting criticism on the part of the opposition and many Conservative MPs, who clamoured about the betrayal of national interests. *The Sunday Times* reporting on the session wrote that citizen Thatcher was sitting pale, her head downcast, while British Defence Minister John Nott was trying to out-voice the rest of them.

...On a trip to London many years ago I visited Westminster, the seat of British Parliament. We were accompanied by a Conservative MP who described their old, time-worn traditions in a typically British manner—with reserve and a pinch of irony. For example, the Speaker of the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor, sits on the wool-sack which symbolises industry and trade—the basis of the British imperial wealth, might and glory. I can imagine how uncomfortable the Lord

Chancellor was on his woolsack! Indeed, His Excellency must have been well aware of the fact that nowadays it is not enough to be propped up by soft wool and that it is much more profitable to sit on valuable raw materials, such as gold, manganese, chromium, diamonds, bauxites and uranium hidden in the Falkland Islands and the nearby Antarctic. What is more, he would apparently prefer his woolsack to be not only solid but also damp with oil, which, according to preliminary estimates, the Falklands possess in amounts exceeding by 800 per cent those found in the North Sea, where Britain, now the world's seventh biggest oil producer, is actively developing its oil reserves. This was evidently the main reason behind the extraordinary hullabaloo and nervousness among the members of the House of Lords, notorious for their reserve, as well as behind the chauvinistic frenzy displayed at that time by the British big bourgeoisie (paradoxically calling itself the "middle class"). The owners of oil monopolies, bankers, ship-builders and big businessmen knew better than anybody else what they might lose with the loss of the Falklands.

The British government introduced an economic and trade embargo against Argentina and urged its EEC and NATO partners to join it, subjecting them to serious pressure. A naval force was speedily dispatched to the Falklands on a neo-colonialist mission. To maintain the armada alone, 50 million pounds sterling were pumped out of the tax payers. Add military losses and those in manpower and equipment and you will know the

cost the British people had to pay for Mrs. Thatcher's military venture.

The United States also showed interest in the Falklands, obviously intent on profiting from the dispute. At first the American Administration declared that it was a good friend of both sides but soon it discarded the mask of a disinterested and just well-wisher and openly sided with its closest and most loyal ally. Britain and its armed forces received the necessary information through an American communications satellite system on the movements of the enemy's army and navy. The United States undertook to maintain communications between the British capital and its squadron in the South Atlantic; American bases also supplied the British fleet with ammunition and fuel.

Argentina, like the rest of Latin America, was swept by a wave of indignation at this relapse of colonialism.

The British have a special attitude towards traditions. Mrs. Thatcher, who decided to revive the traditions of ... British colonialism, is evidently prone to this national weakness too. History shows that the British colonial empire was created largely as a result of piracy and plunder, shameless occupation and deceit. Profitable slave trade had also a role to play. British sailing vessels brought from Africa to America enormous quantities of "black commodity"—nearly 20 million slaves, for 15 pounds sterling each. Enterprise in the colonies was bringing colossal profits which became, as Marx wrote, the primary accumulation ensuring the industrial revolution in Britain.

The history of the British colonial empire is full of violence and blood. In the 20th century blood was often spilt in connection with oil. "He who owns oil owns the world." Victor Berenger, a leading expert in oil in his time and the French ambassador in Washington (could there be some logical connection here?), who made this pronouncement at the beginning of the 20th century, soon after the First World War, knew what he was talking about. He was well-versed in the history of the discovery of this power raw material—the history of murders and assassinations, forgery and wars.

The oil kings—the Rockefellers, the Deterdings, and the Nobels—decided the future of states, financed the most reactionary governments, crowned monarchs, and bought scientists. After the First World War, which took the toll of 10 million human lives, Sir Henry Deterding, an oil nabob, announced that his Royal Dutch Shell earned 69 million Dutch guilders in net profit, that is to say, about seven guilders per person killed. John D. Rockefeller Senior, in his turn, estimated that his Standard Oil Company received a net profit of 460 million dollars and in this way earned 46 dollars per perished life. During the Second World War, in which oil had its own sinister role to play, Standard Oil put into its safes more than 2 billion dollars, while its German partner in the oil cartel, I.G. Farbenindustrie, netted RM 6 billion.

Oil has always been wedded to war and aggression. It was for oil that wars were waged in Mex-

ico, Venezuela, Gran Chaco and the Algerian Sahara. It is oil transnational concerns that are behind the Israeli aggression in the Middle East. And it is the desire to protect the interests of major American oil corporations that is responsible for the export of counter-revolution into Afghanistan under the pretext of the defence of "vital American interests".

In other words, oil smells of blood in the world of capital. This truth was once again corroborated by the British-Argentine conflict over the Falklands.

The war was waged by Margaret Thatcher. She is no Queen Elizabeth, who laid the foundations of the British Empire in the 16th century. Nor is she Winston Churchill, who did his utmost during the Second World War to preserve the remnants of that colonial empire. Thatcher lives in a different period, when colonialism has been denounced by the people and thrown away to the dustheap of history. It is not enough now to have several fast frigates equipped with a dozen of cannon to retain a handful of islands with a population of 2,000. It proved necessary to send most up-to-date British Navy vessels 15,000 kilometres away from home. But even this might have been insufficient had there been no tangible diplomatic, economic and military support by the United States, the richest and strongest imperialist power. Whether they wish it or not, the British Tories would sooner or later have to recognise the new reality of the world in the last quarter of the 20th century.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM, REAL AND IMAGINED

In February 1933, the world learnt that the Reichstag had been "set on fire". The Nazi government, which had just come to power in Germany, announced that the Communists, who allegedly wanted to signal in this way the beginning of an armed uprising, "had a hand in it". In actual fact, however, it was a patent provocation by the Nazis who were launching a campaign of terror against the Communist Party, the workers' movement and democracy in Germany.

The Leipzig show trial directed against the Communist Party was necessary to the Nazis to justify the existence of fascist gangs and mass terror in the eyes of the world public, to trigger a new anti-communist campaign, and to present fascism as a "saviour" of not only Germany but the whole of "civilised Europe" from the "threat of world communism". The key figure among the accused at the Leipzig trial was the outstanding Bulgarian revolutionary Georgi Dimitrov, whose courage during the trial turned him into a wrathful opponent of the fascist regime. Rejecting the calumny directed against the Communists, he said:

"The Communist International...is a world Party, not a mere organisation of conspirators. Such a world Party does not play with insurrection and revolution. Such a Party cannot officially say one thing to its millions of adherents and at the same time in secret do exactly the opposite.

Such a Party . . . does not go in for double book-keeping. . . . I am in favour of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. I am firmly convinced that this is the only way out of, the only salvation from the economic crisis and the catastrophe of war under capitalism. But precisely for this reason I am a convinced opponent of the methods of individual terror and . . . putschist activities . . .”¹

Marxist-Leninists have always rejected and denounced terror as a means of attaining revolutionary goals. Historical experience shows that modern international terrorism as a theory, ideology and political practice was born not of the workers’ movement but of the capitalist system.

Terrorists, both in the past and nowadays, are trying to justify their fruitless actions by the desire to incite the exploited mass of the people to rebel against their exploiters. Lenin, the leader of the October Revolution, responded to this kind of arguments with irony: “Are there not enough outrages committed in Russian life without special ‘excitants’ having to be invented?”²

Terrorists not only failed to “raise” the people but on the contrary, certain sections of the population immersed into passive waiting for “miracles” to follow pistol shots and bombs explosions.

Today’s international terrorism is rejected both by the socialist countries and the international

¹ Georgi Dimitrov, *Leipzig, 1933*, Sofia Press, 1968, pp. 178 and 70.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 1977, p. 420.

Communist and workers' movement because, no matter what the subjective motives of its inspirers may be, it eventually plays into the hands of the world bourgeoisie. There is no denying the fact that fear of terror repulses broad sections of the people from taking part in revolution. The imperialists, in their turn, want to ascribe all sorts of "actions" by organisations, which had usurped revolutionary names and symbols (like, for example, the Rote Armee Fraktion in West Germany or the Red Brigades in Italy), to the progressive forces and the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The bourgeoisie exploits the threat of "leftist" terrorism to encroach upon the democratic rights of the working people and to introduce rigorous laws against the truly revolutionary parties and the social gains of the working class. History shows, that violence and chaos caused by the terrorist activities of the leftists open the road for strong-arm governments and fascist dictatorships.

In international relations leftist terrorism faithfully serves the interests of the aggressive imperialists, who use it to export counter-revolution and to justify their interventionist aims.

All efforts by anti-communist ideologists and imperialist politicians to ascribe terrorist activities to the Communists are doomed to failure because they are not confirmed by facts. Nevertheless, the American Administration tirelessly repeats the nonsense about the "hand of Moscow" directing terrorist activities. This monstrous concoction, or rather its latest version, belongs to former US Secretary of State Alexander Haig, veteran general

and "hero" of the Korean War who became notorious in that country so far away from America by his use of mass terror against the civilian population . . . It was Haig who said that the Soviet Union pursued the policy which encouraged, supported and expanded international terrorism. To "prove" his point, he accused the Soviet Union of supplying arms to the Palestine Liberation Organisation "for terrorist activities", of using Cuba and Libya "in terrorist plans", of supporting in every way wars for national liberation, and so on.

The Americans took urgent measures to reveal the existence of some "global Russian terrorist network" and established for that purpose a special Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism. Specific research was undertaken by the CIA, which was joined by Interpol. So far the findings have, alas, proved unsatisfactory . . .

In its time the French royal court coined the saying "cherchez la femme" . . . Believe it or not, today's politicians took the saying literally and found the woman! A certain Claire Sterling, an American journalist who had been living and working in Rome for more than 30 years, wrote a book under the intriguing title *The Terror Network*. Indeed, why shouldn't an experienced journalist write a book?! This is only natural and understandable. Italy provides a wealth of material on the chosen topic. There are some details, however, that it is not so easy to explain. For example, given the rigorous laws of the international copyright convention, defending the material interests of writers, how could that book be published

simultaneously in several languages? Who paid the forfeit and to whom? How could the book be translated into other languages at such a cosmic speed? Or, perhaps, it is more logical to put it differently—who paid the fee for such a prompt work. I think that he who called the “tune” paid the piper. Indeed, the book appeared as if by somebody’s order and caused quite a sensation...

I have looked through the French edition of this opus. All terrorist acts, the author claims, have been hatched in Moscow, which allegedly wants to “weaken”, “demoralise”, “intimidate”, “paralyse” and if possible “dismantle” Western democratic society. The sixteen chapters of the book deal with international adventurers, real and mythical terrorist organisations, separatist movements, arsons and forgery, “chance” murders and organised car crashes, and so on. But diligent Ms. Sterling failed to prove her main point—that all this is “orchestrated” at a distance by Moscow, even though she profusely quoted staff members of intelligence centres, their chiefs and other shady people of the type of renegade Andrei Sakharov.

Western politicians, ideologists, and propagandists are very skilful in passing things for something else. For scores of years they have been using the word “freedom” when speaking about social and national oppression; they refer to reactionary coups (like, for example, in Chile) as “popular” and even “social” revolution; reactionary dictatorships are called in their idiom “democratic” governments; colonial wars are waged in the “interests” of those attacked, while truly

social revolutions and national liberation struggle are called "arbitrariness", "banditism", and "acts of terror" by international conspirators.

Proceeding from imperialist logic, the US passed the policy of genocide towards the Vietnamese people for "measures of defence" from "communist aggression". The massacre of hundreds of thousands of Communists in Indonesia was called the "triumph of order over communist terrorism". Israel's brigandry in Lebanon, according to the Western press, was the shielding of a "small" and "defenceless" state from Palestinian terrorists. Even the attack by Israeli planes at the construction site of an atomic research centre in Baghdad, this act of piracy, was presented by the reactionary mass media as a "boon" for the people of the Middle East, though had the bombs fallen on that centre after it was put into operation, thousands of people would have died from radioactive exposure! Following the same logic, the counter-revolutionary gangs in Afghanistan, armed by the United States and taught by them how to burn, plunder and kill, are spoken of as "patriots" but not terrorists.

Amazing logic, I should say, and very reminiscent of that used by Claire Sterling. She believes, for instance, that... the virtual absence of acts of terror in the socialist countries confirms her idea that world terrorism is directed from socialist countries. It has never occurred to her that the true reason lies in the fact that the socialist countries have no organisations similar to the CIA or the FBI, which do train terrorists, and that the very

social system of those states excludes the possibility for the appearance of gangs and brigades, which draw a bead on trade union activists, terrorise political leaders and assassinate presidents.

Organised crime pervades the whole of capitalist society. The ruling class violates law on a large scale, evading income tax payments which is something even the most sophisticated computers are unable to stop and resorting to blackmail, bribe-taking, the selling of economic and industrial secrets and even physical extermination of rivals. The logic of crime inevitably leads to terror against political opponents. This is how a system is formed, which includes not only mafia but also the CIA and the FBI, that is to say, US government departments.

In the past the bourgeoisie waged endless wars of conquest and formed gigantic colonial domains. History will never forget nor forgive merciless terror and the forced transportation of slaves from the African continent to American plantations, the aborigines in shackles, genocide against the American Indians and the killing of all those who rose against oppression and exploitation.

Popular saying has it: "The darkest hour is that before the dawn." The historic victory of the Soviet Union over Nazi Germany also spelt the defeat of racist theories and the triumph of the ideas of national liberation and people's equality. Great Britain, France and the Netherlands had to yield to the national liberation movement in their colonies, and the colonial system of imperialism began to crumble.

The narrowing of the sphere of imperialist domination in the world, growing internal contradictions in the capitalist countries and rivalry between them heightened imperialism's aggressiveness, above all that of US imperialism. In a bid to restore its positions in the world, imperialism is stepping up its confrontation with the world of socialism.

Long years of unsuccessful attempts to contain the onslaught of the national liberation movement have, beyond doubt, upset the White House officials, who could think of nothing better than to brand any manifestation of popular disagreement with the idea of Pax Americana as "international terrorism". Sooner or later the myth of international terrorism will be dispelled, but nothing will erase from people's memory the crimes of imperialism—genuine terrorism used as a means to export counter-revolution.

ECONOMIC SUBVERSION

Blinded by the pathological hatred of the socialist countries, the American Administration with persistence worthy of a better cause, is trying to use economic pressure against the USSR and other socialist countries. In the past few years it laid embargo on equipment for the Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline to delay and, if possible, wreck the project; on credits to restrict the flow of up-to-date technology from Western Europe and in this way to impede the economic development of the "culprit" countries; and on grain and other

farm produce to disrupt food supplies and even . . . cause "famine in the USSR".

There is nothing original in all the steps Washington takes. The idea of using economic sanctions against socialism occurred to the imperialists in fact right after the victory of the October Revolution. The United States was the first to envoke it in November 1917 when its government announced that no goods would be sent to Russia.

While launching an armed intervention against the young Soviet state, the West simultaneously took economic measures in a bid to starve the socialist revolution in Russia to death. On October 10, 1919, the Entente Supreme Council officially announced the blockade of the Soviet republic and called upon the neutral states to join it. They were asked to refrain from sending ships to Soviet ports, to forbid their banks all finance operations with Soviet Russia and to stop postal, telegraph and radio-telegraph communications with it. But just as the military intervention fizzled out, the economic blockade, another form of the export of counter-revolution, proved to be ineffective. In January 1920, a mere three months later, the Entente leaders had to lift the ban on exchanges of commodities with Russia. That was a formal act of lifting the blockade. However, the imperialist states never abandoned their attempts to use all sorts of economic sanctions to exercise political pressure on the Soviet republic.

In 1922, Jiri Volker, a well-known Czech Communist poet, wrote a poem, "Photographs". He could not pass indifferently by shop-windows dis-

playing, among pictures and books, photographs
made in the Volga Area, struck by famine:

Beautiful life is depicted in books,
like in paintings,
But the latter are merely pictures,
Even if truthful in every detail.
Photographs strike by being true to life.
Telling stories that cut like a knife:
Russia is starving!
Russia is starving!

Drought and bad harvest in 1921 caused famine in the Volga Area. The ruling circles of the US, France and other imperialist states jumped at the opportunity to try again and make Soviet Russia capitulate. This was especially graphically demonstrated by the Conference of the International Russian Famine Relief Commission held in Brussels in October 1921. The imperialists were ready to give relief to starving Russians, provided the Soviet government agreed to pay all the pre-war and wartime debts of the tsarist regime and to return nationalised property to foreign capitalists. To export counter-revolution by hook or by crook—that was their cherished dream. Lenin who headed the Soviet government at that time said that “they now want to use famine in Russia to trample upon our hard-won freedom and to strip the workers and peasants of power forever...”¹

As a matter of fact, Western rulers were quite

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Fifth Russian edition, Vol. 53, p. 247.

frank about their ultimate goals. In 1921, US Secretary of State Charles Hughes openly declared that relations with the Soviet republic could be normalised provided fundamental changes were made in the Soviet socialist system.

The same policy was pursued towards the Soviet republic proclaimed in Hungary in March 1919 under the impact of the victorious October Revolution. There, too, the imperialists resorted to an economic blockade, along with an armed intervention. Herbert Hoover, who headed the American Relief Administration in Europe, cynically said that he was not going to give bread to the Bolsheviks.

The American Relief Administration can serve as typical example of how Washington used and continues using economic "aid" to other countries in its selfish interests, to further its political aims. Set up in the US in 1919, the organisation in fact worked to strengthen the economic and political positions of American imperialism and to combat the revolutionary movement under the guise of giving food and other types of aid to European countries which suffered considerable losses in the First World War. While taking economic sanctions against the Soviet republic in Hungary, the ARA aided in every way the bloody Horthy regime and the Pilsudski government of the bourgeoisie and landowners in Poland. It also engaged in intelligence activities, collecting information about the economic and military potential of European countries. During the 1921 famine in the Volga Area the Soviet government allowed the ARA to

operate in the Russian Federation. But the ARA used the opportunity to set up its apparatus in Soviet Russia in order to engage in spying and subversion and to support the counter-revolutionary elements. In June 1923, its work in the Russian Federation was stopped and soon afterwards the organisation itself ceased to exist.

Something similar but on a far greater scale was also offered by Washington to Europe after the Second World War. June 1947 saw the emergence of the Marshall Plan named so after George Marshall, the then US Secretary of State who masterminded it. The United States, which had enriched itself in the war and emerged practically unscathed by it, undertook to organise "aid" to Western Europe. Officially the plan had the high-sounding aim "to help these countries to rehabilitate their economies". In practice, however, its tasks were more specific and far from selfless. On the one hand, American imperialists wanted to prop up the ruling classes of West European countries and to consolidate the capitalist system in a bid to offset progressive tendencies growing among the people. On the other hand, the US hoped to use "aid" to enhance its political influence in the recipient countries and to subject them to its diktat.

The Marshall Plan had still another far-reaching task, namely, to try and break away the People's Democracies from the Soviet Union, to allay the revolutionary upsurge in post-war Eastern Europe and to perpetuate the capitalist system there. But the People's Democracies rejected the Marshall

Plan because they did not want, to quote a 19th-century Czech poet Jan Neruda, "in humbleness to lick the lashes that had for centuries been whipping them for a handful of rotten rice".

Czechoslovakia had a disastrously bad harvest in 1947 and faced the threat of grave food shortages and, perhaps, even famine.

Even before that, one of the reactionary ministers, right-wing Social Democrat Vaclav Majer, started to advertise canned horse-flesh, which was later on delivered to the country from storehouses of American army surplus through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Outwardly, it looked as if the Americans and especially Majer were holding out a helping hand to Czechoslovakia. But when the country found itself in a really bad way because of crop failure the Americans stopped delivering canned meat. Czechoslovakia did receive effective and disinterested aid from none other than the Soviet Union, which sent 600,000 tons of grain, despite the fact that, it too, had had a bad harvest as a result of drought in its southern regions.

The post-war period opened good prospects for economic cooperation between the Western capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. But the aggressive politicians got the upper hand in the largest country of the capitalist world. Striving after world domination and confrontation with socialism, Washington gave the world first the anti-communist Truman Doctrine and then the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which

comprised for the most part the countries granted aid in keeping with the Marshall Plan. The cold war soon produced another idea, which the Paris Conference of the NATO countries and Japan embodied in the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls (COCOM) which actually controls exports to socialist countries. That was in fact another attempt to exercise economic pressure on socialism, this time represented by a group of countries rather than by the Soviet Union alone.

In the early 1950s, items which were listed as "strategic" and banned from being exported to the socialist countries numbered more than 2,000. In practice that meant that, for example, a rolling mill, for which big money had already been paid, remained for many years in an American dock. The American cold war strategists believed that such bans on machinery and equipment sales to the socialist countries would, if not frustrate, then at least considerably slacken their economic development.

Under the circumstances the socialist countries could not count on any aid from the outside but still managed not only to keep up with the West but in some cases even to outstrip it. The launching of the first Soviet satellite, which heralded the beginning of the space age, provided the most convincing proof of the fact that the economic embargo of the cold war period was ineffective.

It can be said today that Washington has learnt nothing from the experience. It continues to bully the socialist countries with an economic em-

bargo, even though the latter hits first and foremost certain sections of the American population itself or some of US allies.

As a result of the embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union laid by President Carter, American farmers and businessmen lost 22 billion dollars, according to American press estimates. Similarly, the workers of the American Caterpillar Company became the first victims of the embargo laid by President Reagan on supplies of equipment for the Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline under construction in the USSR. The company lost an advantageous order for a large batch of pipe-laying machines.

The gas pipeline project was, however, little affected by the embargo. It could not be otherwise. After all, the pipeline transporting gas to Western Europe (which on Soviet territory follows the route Urengoi-Pomary-Uzhgorod) is but one of six transcontinental pipelines by which Siberian gas goes primarily to the European part of the USSR. When they learnt about the American president's efforts to thwart the building of the gas pipeline, Soviet workers directly engaged in laying the pipeline and those making compressor plants, pipe-laying and other machines and equipment took additional commitments and saw to it that the pipeline was put into operation in time.

The American embargo held likewise no force in West European countries, which had contracted to supply the project with equipment and pipes in exchange for gas, approximately 40,000 million cubic metres a year, Reagan's arbitrary actions

were seen in West Germany, France, Britain and other West European states as interference in their domestic affairs and a tactic leading only to aggravating their economic situation, deplorable as it was. Indeed, the orders for building an export gas pipeline from Siberia alone gave jobs to tens of thousands of West Europeans. According to expert estimates, economic cooperation with the socialist world gives Western countries more than 3,000,000 jobs. This is something to think about, especially if we recall that in the mid-1980s the industrially developed capitalist countries had over 35,000,000 unemployed.

But the conditions of workers in the United States, to say nothing of Western Europe, are obviously of little concern to Reagan and those whose interests he represents. It is an altogether different matter when it comes to the interests of monopolies, for instance, those of the Californian Bechtel Company which, according to the American press' well-justified claims, largely affects the White House policy. Bechtel is the US biggest builder of oil and gas pipelines. At present it is working on long-term plans for exporting gas from the so far undeveloped Alaskan deposits to Japan and Western Europe. A contract for gas deliveries from Siberia to West European countries can therefore deprive Bechtel of the expected profits. That's where the trouble lies!

Having failed to upset the working schedule of the Siberian export gas pipeline project and facing the staunch resistance of West European countries and even some sober-minded American

businessmen, President Reagan had to cancel in November 1982 his sanctions against the Soviet Union. That was the inglorious end of still another attempt by the Washington Administration at economic blackmail.

One would think he had been taught a serious lesson, but only a few months later, in March 1983, President Reagan introduced a bill in Congress, this time envisaging ... trade sanctions against the states, which "in contravention to American instructions" supply the USSR with latest technology. It looks like another attempt to bring the COCOM back to life; and not the last one, I am afraid. But what's the good of it?

BEWARE OF POISONED RADIOWAVES!

To facilitate the export of counter-revolution the imperialist states have used numerous channels of radio broadcasting and also the TV in the past few years. The American strategists of ideological subversion and psychological warfare remember only too well the advice given in his time by US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger to the effect that in relations with many countries one radio station can be a more effective means of pressure, than a squadron of bombers. As a matter of fact, Washington had been guided by similar considerations long before Kissinger entered the Department of State.

Already in the early 1950s, during the cold war period, the US adopted a Mutual Security Act,

which was directed against the socialist countries and empowered the government to use overseas propaganda to exercise planned and systematic influence on other nations' public opinion. 'There were no doubts left as to the nature of that "influence"' because simultaneously the first 100 million dollars were appropriated to set up subversion centres and to arm terrorist groups employing defectors from socialist countries. Pretty soon Radio Free Europe (RFE) was founded with the blessing of CIA boss Allen Dulles and his colleague from the Office of Strategic Services, William Donovan, to engage in subversive propaganda among the East European socialist countries.

Taking cover behind the façade of a public organisation called the Free Europe Foundation, that radio station actually became an affiliate of the CIA, which supplied 85 per cent of its budget. It was the American masters of Free Europe who formulated the main tasks of the radio station, namely: to organise and guide political emigration from socialist countries, and to struggle against the social system established there. The various sections of Radio Free Europe broadcasting to individual countries employ all sorts of renegades and traitors, up to former Nazi collaborators, who work in the sweat of their brow to earn their thirty pieces of silver.

The subversive mission of Radio Free Europe became especially manifest during the 1956 events in Hungary and in 1968, when the imperialist forces tried to edge Czechoslovakia away from the socialist community.

Not far from Munich (West Germany), the RFE base, another subversive American radio station with the no less ambitious name of Radio Liberty is broadcasting in national languages of Soviet peoples. The two radio stations are a typical example of "black" or "grey" propaganda which, according to the classification offered by Western theoreticians of the mass media, is carried out without reference to its source.

Western scholars make a distinction between this type of propaganda and "white", official propaganda coming from an openly stated source, as exemplified by the US government-controlled Voice of America. But is there in fact any difference between the Voice of America broadcasts intended for the inhabitants of the socialist countries and those broadcast by RFE-RL from Munich? Even the most scrupulous analysis is unable to reveal any difference of principle in their content. All of them are characterised by the same anti-communism and the desire to use all means, falsifications and patent lies included, to denigrate the way of life in the socialist states and to gloss the scourges of bourgeois society in the capitalist countries, hypocritically called the "free world". Just as hypocritical are their comments on world politics, in which they go out of their way to present the arms race and Washington's preparations for a nuclear war as "concern for peace", whereas the truly peaceful initiatives of the socialist community are said to be "threatening" the security of nations. The Voice of America programmes have the same dirty aims as the pro-

grammes of the CIA stations in Munich. It won't be a mistake to say that all the radio stations of the imperialist states, be it the BBC, Deutsche Welle or the Kol-Israel, systematically beam anti-communist propaganda throughout the world in a bid to undermine the consolidating positions of the socialist states and to sap the growing influence of the Marxist-Leninist ideas.

The case of Czechoslovakia shows only too well how the West is mounting its radio propaganda efforts against the socialist countries. Fourteen Western radio stations use 90 frequencies to broadcast for listeners in Czechoslovakia for a total of 37 hours a day, with Radio Free Europe accounting for 20 hours of broadcasting on 14 frequencies in Czech and Slovak. Official government radio stations, such as the BBC and Deutsche Welle, also echo this anti-Czechoslovak chorus.

The West not only concentrates but also coordinates its efforts in anti-socialist propaganda. This refers both to the technical means and, perhaps to a greater extent, to the subject matter of programmes, their orientation and topics. Small wonder therefore that, just as some anti-Soviet and anti-communist writing appears simultaneously in several Western countries their radio stations also in unison discuss certain topics of anti-communist propaganda.

All this has long been orchestrated by Washington, which has a ramified system of channels of ideological pressure, with the special ideological services of the CIA and the Pentagon featuring prominently in it. According to press reports,

the CIA has more than 800 different propaganda bodies "in the sphere of influence", and the Pentagon up to 300 radio and TV stations scattered all over the globe.

Under President Carter his propaganda services tried to exploit the "human rights" problem in their attacks against the socialist countries and extolling "Western democracy". The obvious bankruptcy of that demagogic campaign forced the Reagan Administration that succeeded the Carter Administration to look for new avenues. It opted for the thesis of "combating international terrorism", hoping to use it as a cover in stepping up US interference in other states' affairs in order to be able to dictate its will to them, to impose its practices. Reagan and his retinue chose radio broadcasting as a more effective means to implement these hegemonistic plans. The Reagan Administration showed readiness to raise the role of radio broadcasting as an instrument of US foreign policy and to use the Voice of America in particular as an offensive weapon.

It appears that the official government radio station is regarded as a means of direct ideological aggression. The Voice of America broadcasts in 39 languages for a total of more than 940 hours a week, with 77 per cent of its programmes beamed to the socialist countries. It is significant that the first budget proposed by Reagan for that radio station for 1982 envisaged an increase in appropriations from 101.5 million dollars to 188 million dollars. The CIA radio branches in Munich were not forgotten either and are now openly fi-

nanced from the US state budget. Appropriations for subversive Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were raised to 95.8 million dollars in 1983, that is, almost double the amount they received in 1975 when detente was still alive.

Washington's generosity has never been disinterested and in that particular case it was connected with plans to make an ever wider use of radio propaganda in the interests of the US military-industrial complex. This was borne out by the organisational measures taken by the Reagan Administration to restructure the apparatus and to replace the heads of the major propaganda services. First the White House announced that the International Communication Agency, which coordinated the activity of all the US mass media intended for outside consumption was again renamed into the US Information Agency (USIA). Then Kenneth Tomlinson was appointed the new director of the Voice of America. Several days later the "commander-in-chief" of RFE-RL was replaced by Senator James L. Buckley.

The latter has long been known in Washington as a die-hard hawk, who opposed the Soviet-American SALT-2 in the Senate and called for the use of armed force wherever the interests of American monopolies were endangered. He showed great zeal in working out the "economic sanctions" against the USSR and Poland imposed by the Reagan Administration.

Tomlinson, the new director of the Voice of America, is a match to Buckley. In the past he headed a magazine which was distinguished even

among the American yellow press by its obscurantism and hatred of communism and socialism.

The appointment of new people as heads of the major American centres of radio propaganda is quite symptomatic and shows that the Reagan Administration is not satisfied with their work, particularly in connection with the Polish events. This dissatisfaction stems, of course, not from the subversive nature of the programmes but from their insufficient effectiveness.

It may seem that the US President hardly has any reason for such conclusions. Both RFE-RL and the Voice of America, in violation of all international norms and above all the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, bluntly interfere in the Polish internal affairs by mounting a rabid campaign to discredit the socialist system in that country. Addressing the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives on August 18, 1981, Zygmunt Michalowski, director of the Polish section of the RFE, frankly admitted that the Polish events had been prepared by local dissidents aided by Radio Free Europe. When martial law was introduced in Poland on December 13, 1981, the Voice of America doubled to 5 hours its daily 2.5 hours of Polish-language newscasts and then extended these programmes to a total of 7 hours a day. At the same time the 150 staff members of the RFE Polish section (its programmes are broadcast 20 hours a day) started to work round the clock, preparing material containing direct instructions to the counter-revolutionary underground. The official US gov-

ernment mouthpiece did not stay aloof from that provocative campaign. For instance, on May 2, 1982, the Voice of America broadcast as "reports from Warsaw" the exact time and location of counter-revolutionary rallies that were to cause disturbances in the Polish capital the next day.

All this, however, failed to produce the effect Washington had hoped for, just as the anti-Polish TV show went flat in January 1982, despite its wide publicity. Incidentally, no major Western TV company agreed to cooperate with the US Foreign Relations Department in organising that provocative venture.

The fizzled-out TV show, in which Ronald Reagan personally participated, beyond doubt marred the President's prestige. Nevertheless, it can hardly be considered a sufficient ground for the reorganisation of the Foreign Relations Department. The Department was to a certain extent a concession to detente, whereas the activity of the US Information Agency was connected with psychological warfare during the cold war period. Apparently, this was the reason for restoring the old name of Washington's central foreign policy propaganda department, in order to "squeeze" additional propaganda effect even from that act. The appointment of hard-liners to head the Voice of America and RFE-RL reveals the role assigned to radio broadcasting within the framework of the frankly aggressive course adopted by the Washington Administration in international affairs.

Ronald Reagan expounded the line of his Ad-

ministration in his address to the British MPs in the summer of 1982 when he urged them to start a "crusade" against the socialist countries. Following this line, in January 1983, the President issued Directive No. 77, founding a special cabinet-level committee for "propaganda planning". William P. Clark, the President's national-security adviser, was put in charge of the committee. Overseas broadcast service which as it has been mentioned earlier, Ronald Reagan called an "offensive weapon", featured prominently among the problems he had to tackle.

It can be said in conclusion that the way present-day imperialism, first and foremost American imperialism, exploits radiowaves emphatically corroborates the opinion of the Soviet Communists who say that the imperialists and their accomplices are systematically conducting hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They malign and distort everything that goes on there. For them the main thing is to turn people against socialism.

The Communists send a warning to the fraternal nations: "Beware of poisoned radiowaves!"

THE SOVIET UNION: WORKING FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

FOLLOWING THE PRINCIPLES OF PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Historical experience teaches us that old, outgoing regimes have always sought to block social changes. However, all attempts of this type invariably failed in the long run because the objective course of history cannot be stopped. One should not forget, however, that there has never been nor can there be a revolution without overt or covert resistance by reaction. We have seen that the arsenal of the present-day exporters of counter-revolution includes interference in other countries' domestic affairs, pillaging, violence, forgery, assassination and wars—all entailing bloodshed . . .

The policy of world-wide brigandage and violation of the peoples' will has for almost 70 years now been countered with the policy of peace and social progress pursued by the Soviet Union. Mankind has found in the world's first socialist state a reliable bulwark in the struggle against predatory wars, and for peace and the security of nations. The Decree on Peace proclaimed in the early hours of the existence of this state of a new type raised aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism and international solidarity of the working people in their struggle for a peaceful and happy future. That was why the enemies of the rev-

olution reviled that decree in every way, claiming it to be of purely "propaganda nature" and accusing Soviet Russia of "exporting revolution". This is one of the favorite concoctions of the enemies of socialism who have always deliberately distorted the way the Soviet working class understood its internationalist duty to the proletariat of other countries.

Soviet foreign policy of peace has always emphatically rejected both the export of revolution and the export of counter-revolution. The Soviet people feel profound sympathy for the revolutionary forces active in the capitalist world, express class solidarity with them and support them. This support is given not through the export of revolution but through opposition to the imperialist powers' interference in the internal affairs of peoples, that is to say, to the export of counter-revolution. The policy of peaceful coexistence, which is pivotal to Soviet foreign policy, far from contravening the tasks of developing the revolutionary process, helps to accomplish them by deterring the aggressive imperialist forces and stopping the imperialist export of counter-revolution.

The Marxist-Leninists interpret proletarian internationalism as their responsibility for the destiny of socialism not only in their own country but throughout the world; as profound respect for the national and historical singularities of the development of every nation; as the readiness to give widest possible support to each other and understanding of the historic mission of the socialist countries in the world revolutionary process and

in supporting the national liberation and anti-imperialist struggle.

In the past few years world developments repeatedly proved that proletarian internationalism, the solidarity and unity of action of the fraternal states are an effective weapon in countering the attempts by reaction to restore the capitalist system in the socialist countries.

The American debacle in Vietnam illustrates that the policy aiming at the export of counter-revolution has no future and is historically doomed. That aggression was imperialism's largest attempt since the Second World War to destroy a socialist state with the help of arms and to crush the national liberation revolution.

The historic lesson of Vietnam shows that the courage of a nation fighting for a just cause coupled with the life-giving force of proletarian internationalism and the solidarity of the socialist countries and of all the peace-loving progressive forces is capable of defeating an imperialist aggression. This lesson graphically demonstrated that proletarian internationalism was a powerful and active factor in international relations of our day, capable of influencing decisively the course of events.

THE LIBERATION MISSION OF THE SOVIET UNION

We see the liberation mission of the Soviet Union during the Second World War in the fact that the destiny of humanity was decided at the Soviet-German front, the main front in the war. It

cost the Soviet people a titanic effort and required mobilisation of the country's entire resources to repel the Nazi aggression. Even in those dire conditions the Soviet Union found the means to help the anti-fascist Resistance movement in the countries under the Nazi occupation.

By saving their homeland from the imperialist invasion, the Soviet people accomplished their great national task and also performed their internationalist duty to all those fighting for their social and national liberation. As a result the international prestige and sway of the USSR had grown immeasurably.

The Soviet Army had a decisive role to play in liberating completely or partially ten European and two Asian countries. The German people were freed from the murderous dictatorship and, to quote Wilhelm Pieck, were indebted to the Soviet Union for "the preservation of their national existence".¹

Even statesmen who had little sympathy for the Soviet social system paid tribute to the Soviet people for their contribution in crushing the German-Japanese military machine. General Charles de Gaulle thought that Russian victories were "the major condition of the liberation"² of France. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, an avowed anti-communist, wrote in February 1945 on the occasion of Soviet Army Day: "The Red Army

¹ Wilhelm Pieck, *Reden und Aufsätze*, Vol. III, Berlin, 1954, p. 103.

² *Journal Officiel de la République Française*, No. 85, December 22, 1944, p. 595.

celebrates its twenty-seventh anniversary and triumphs which have won the unstinted applause of the allies and have sealed the doom of German militarism. Future generations will acknowledge their debt to the Red Army as unreservedly as do we who have lived to witness these proud achievements."¹

The Soviet Union gave invaluable support to socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, using its authority to preclude the export of counter-revolution into the countries which after the war embarked upon the road of democratic development. The world at large could witness an example of the imperialist export of counter-revolution in the British intervention in Greece after the Second World War. The United States and its allies sought to spread the "Greek experience" to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and other countries. However, the firm stand adopted by the Soviet Union raised an insurmountable obstacle for the forces of reaction which tried to restore Europe to its prewar status, and created favourable conditions for triumphant socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, leading subsequently to the formation of the socialist community. The imperialists found it beyond their capacity to export counter-revolution.

¹ *Correspondence Between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the President of the USA and the Prime Minister of Great Britain During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945*, Vol. I, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1957, pp. 305-306.

In Western Europe, on the contrary, the presence of British and American troops prevented brewing revolutionary democratic transformations.

IMPERIALIST CONSPIRACIES

While sending a message of greetings to the Soviet Army, Churchill was at the same time contemplating in cold blood a possibility of using the remaining German army units and German weapons against the Soviet Union. Already in October 1942, having realised that the USSR would win in that war and deliver European peoples from fascism, Churchill sent the British War Cabinet a memorandum setting forth the task of forming a coalition of European states directed against the Soviet Union and the socialist movement in Europe. "I must admit," he wrote, "that my thoughts rest primarily in Europe—the revival of the glory of Europe, that parent continent of the modern nations and civilisation. It would be a measureless disaster if Russian barbarism overlaid the culture and independence of the ancient States of Europe. Hard as it is to say now, I trust that the European family may act unitedly as one under a Council of Europe. I look forward to a United States of Europe..."¹ That was the most unambiguous declaration of the imperialist policy which contravened the Soviet policy of democratic post-war peace.

¹ W. S. Churchill, *The Second World War*. Vol. IV, Cassel & Co. LTD, London, 1951, p. 504.

For the USSR the major task was not only to stop the fascist aggression but also to counteract the counter-revolutionary aspirations of certain elements in the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. Palme R. Dutt, one of the leaders of the British Communist Party, said that by 1943 the prospects of the downfall of fascism and the victory of communism sent Western rulers into panic. The Western allies had every reason to fear that the defeat of fascism might stimulate the development of a socialist revolution. Hence their persistent desire to maintain the reactionary regimes in the countries liberated from the Nazi invaders.

The task was not an easy one, because national democratic governments had been formed in the liberated countries with the broad participation of representatives of anti-fascist parties and groups, Communists included, who wielded tremendous authority. In France the Communists received more than five million votes during the 1945 and 1946 elections and emerged as a major political party in the country. The Italian Communist Party also became a leading force. Holding some ministerial portfolios in these countries, the Communists actively helped to rehabilitate the post-war economy and social life.

These developments were not to the liking of the imperialists, who strove to join forces with their allies from among the reactionary strata of the population in the liberated countries, the right-wing Social Democrats and the Catholic Church. In some West and South European countries the US and Britain succeeded in blocking

the development of democratic transformations (Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, etc.).

Resorting to economic and political pressure in Western Europe, the US and its allies ensured by spring 1947 that the Communists were removed from the West European governments.

Notwithstanding the fact, a paramount consequence of the Second World War was the weakening and undermining of the imperialist system and the change in the alignment of forces in favour of socialism. The international prestige of the Soviet Union grew immensely, while the positions of the leading capitalist states were considerably shattered. Most of them—not only the losers but also those from among the winners—were so debilitated by the war that they found themselves dependent, economically and politically, on the United States. The economic and subsequently political and military centre of imperialism shifted from Europe to the US. American monopoly capital, swollen on war profits and the arms race, became the biggest and most powerful world exploiter.

Following the Second World War, the imperialist powers spearheaded by the US started to pursue the policy from the position of strength. Soon after stepping into presidency Harry Truman stated that the victory won had placed upon the American people constant responsibility for the guidance of the world. No comment is needed, I believe...

Hardly had the war ended that the Soviet Union had to face the cold war unleashed by the more

aggressive imperialists. Slander and provocations, nuclear blackmail and economic blockade were used against the socialist countries. Imperialism, unwilling to allow the further revolutionary rejuvenation of the planet, attempted to take social revenge of sorts in another fit of counter-revolutionary frenzy.

TWO APPROACHES TO THE GERMAN PROBLEM

The position adopted by the Soviet Union on the problem of Germany was dictated by the desire to preclude the rebirth of militarism in that country, which had plunged mankind into gory wars twice in the course of the 20th century. A new Germany could not come into being at a stroke. It was not a matter of merely redressing the state institutions or reshuffling the ruling elite: the country had to be demilitarised, democratised and denazified.

Noteworthy is the difference in the approach to the problem by the Western powers and that adopted by the Soviet Union. The situation seemed to be clear. Even before the end of the war the Allies had come to an understanding that Germany would be revived on the democratic and peaceful principles, and that measures would be taken to preclude the revival of militarism and Nazism and to ensure the elimination of their social base in governmental, economic and public fields.

In the Soviet occupation zone demilitarisation

was completed by December 1947, while the other zones procrastinated as a result of the policy pursued by the Western powers, which were intent to preserve the material and technical base of German militarism. Hundreds of Nazi military units continued operating in the Western zones under the guise of "labour battalions", "guard companies", "German service groups", and "industrial police". Even in late 1947, hundreds of munitions factories, depots and military installations remained intact.

A similar situation existed in the Western zones in the field of denazification. The overwhelming majority of the Nazis were not called to account. General Clay, who was at the time deputy to the US commander-in-chief in Germany, wrote in *The New York Times* on November 6, 1946, that the denazification law in the US zone "was largely slanted in such a way as to return as many people as possible to their former posts rather than to punish the guilty".

In the Soviet zone the problem of denazification was tackled in a different way. Nazi war criminals were called to account and purges were carried out in the police, the press, courts, self-government bodies and schools. The property of active Nazis and war criminals was confiscated and handed over to self-government bodies.

An agrarian reform was carried out in East Germany, giving land to 530,000 peasant farms. Attempts by the working people to legalise the nationalisation of heavy industry and the agrarian reform were thwarted in the Western powers' oc-

cupation zone. For instance, during a plebiscite in the land of Hessen 70 per cent of voters spoke out in favour of nationalising some industries, but the US occupation authorities disregarded public opinion. The Labour government, which came to replace the Churchill Cabinet after the war, pursued the same policy, impeding the nationalisation of heavy industry in North Rhine-Westphalia, the largest industrial region in West Germany. The British, US and French occupation authorities foiled the agrarian reform which would have met the demands of the toiling peasants.

In this way, democratic changes were effected only in the Soviet occupation zone, turning East Germany from a stronghold of the junkers and the Prussian brass into a base for the renaissance of the German people. The Soviet Union did its utmost to aid these democratic transformations most extensively and disinterestedly.

The US, British and French governments sought to use vanquished Germany in their imperialist military-political interests and to combat socialism, which was strengthening its positions there. Unable to lead the whole of Germany along that line, they deliberately worked towards splitting the country and reviving the reactionary regime and the militarist revanchist forces in the Western occupation zones.

THE BROKEN CHAINS OF COLONIALISM

The centuries-old myth of the "invincibility" of the colonialists, painstakingly cultivated by the imperialists, finally exploded during the Second

World War; the system of colonial enslavement and exploitation, a mainstay of imperialism's power and wealth was shattered. The victory of the Soviet Union cleared the way for the oppressed nations to revolutionary action against colonialism.

After the war the Soviet state continued giving ever growing support to the oppressed nations in their struggle for national independence. These nations found in the USSR a reliable and selfless friend invariably defending their interests. The Soviet Union and the states which had attained national independence (though often docked as a result of the manoeuvres by former colonialists) established relations on the principles of full equality and mutual respect without any reservations or restrictions.

It gave the newly free states considerable economic aid which helped strengthen their independence and sovereignty and attached no strings of political, military or any other nature that might be incompatible with their sovereignty or national interests. The Soviet Union was not after profit and, characteristically enough, sought no special rights at the industrial enterprises and other projects built with its aid. Financial aid was given on easy terms, on 2-2.5 per cent annual interest. The USSR fostered the determination of the newly free states to liberate themselves completely from imperialist exploitation and to dispose of their national wealth of their own free will. The late 1970s saw the further strengthening of mutual contacts and comprehensive coopera-

tion between the USSR and developing countries. The number of Asian, African and Latin American countries with which the USSR concluded agreements on economic and technical cooperation grew from 40 in 1970 to 64 in 1978.

In the post-war years the Soviet Union is known to have helped developing countries build more than 1,050 industrial enterprises and other projects. Among them were such major works as the Aswan dam in Egypt, the Euphratus dam in Syria, the steel works in Bhilai, India, and so on.

There were also large-scale transfers of up-to-date technology on easy terms. Besides, the USSR helped newly free countries train specialists in different economic sectors, whose number exceeded half a million.

With the emergence of the world socialist system aid to developing countries grew in scale, while they stayed as before in the focus of attention of the world counter-revolutionary forces. This aid nurtured the freedom-loving aspirations of the people and promoted their choosing a non-capitalist road of development.

SELFLESS AID

The forces of reaction that had unleashed the cold war failed either to stamp out or weaken socialism. Relations of an essentially new type began taking shape between the Soviet Union and East European countries which had embarked upon democratic development. The unprecedented nature of these relations became manifest already soon after the East European countries had been

liberated from the Nazi occupation, when the Soviet Union, which had itself suffered greatly in that war, started to give aid to those countries whose economies were on the verge of collapse. Suffice it to recall that in 1947 Rumanian industrial production was less than half the 1938 level, Bulgarian industry produced less than two-thirds of its pre-war industrial output, more than 70 per cent of all industrial enterprises were destroyed in Poland during the occupation period, and Hungarian industrial production barely equalled one-third of the 1938 level. The Nazi invasion had caused tremendous damage in Czechoslovakia.

Soviet economic aid largely contributed to the economic rehabilitation of each of the East European countries. For example, already in 1945 Bulgaria received 30,000 tons of corn and 20,000 tons of wheat from the Soviet Union. In 1946 the Bulgarian government again asked the Soviet Union for 40,000 tons of grain needed to feed its population, and that request was met in the course of several months. Apart from that, in the period from 1945 to 1947 the USSR delivered to Bulgaria 229,000 tons of oil products and oils, 217,000 tons of metal and metalwork, 33,000 tons of cotton, 72,000 sets of automobile tyres, 2,020 lorries and tractors, and a sizeable amount of harvesting combines, agricultural machinery, carriages, etc.

In 1945, the Soviet Union gave Rumania a loan in the form of 300,000 tons of grain. Rumanian Prime Minister Petru Groza said in 1947: "The years of drought put us in a difficult situation. We had to pay in gold for the corn from

the West. The terms forced on us were onerous, and we got very little corn for all that. Once more we had to knock on the door of our friends in the East. We knew that they had a drought. Nevertheless last year they loaned us 30,000 carriage-loads of grain, which they delivered to our doorstep without asking for any guarantees or demanding gold. We have not been able to repay that debt and again appealed to our friends for help and they understood us and are helping us again."

The USSR adhered to the same principles in its relations with Czechoslovakia. Reaction hoped to use the drought of 1947 against the young popular democratic regime. At that time the Soviet Union stretched its helping hand to the peoples of Czechoslovakia: despite considerable food shortages at home, it delivered 600,000 tons of grain to the friendly country. Besides, in keeping with an agreement signed on December 14, 1948, the USSR gave Czechoslovakia a loan of 132,500,000 roubles in gold (on 2.5 per cent annual interest).

The Soviet Union never sought to gain political or economic advantages for the aid it gave. Its principled policy facilitated the building of a firm base for the further development and expansion of economic cooperation and for the evolution of new forms of economic relations among the socialist states.

COMMUNITY OF FRATERNAL NATIONS

As friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the People's Democracies in Central and South-East Europe progressed, the problems of

strengthening their economic ties as a base for a world socialist system increasingly gained in importance.

At first, as we have seen, these relations primarily boiled down to Soviet gratuitous aid, credits and technical assistance in rehabilitating devastated enterprises, and so on. With time economic co-operation diversified on the basis of mutually advantageous bilateral agreements. In the late 1940s, new long-term forms of cooperation and the world socialist market were still in the making but, nevertheless, the need was increasingly felt to coordinate the economic policies of the People's Democracies and the Soviet Union, and to create a fundamentally new system of foreign economic relations.

Extensive economic cooperation among the socialist countries was largely promoted by the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), founded on the decision of a conference of the representatives of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the USSR held in January 1949. The council was conceived as an open organisation, and later on some other countries joined it, including Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia and Vietnam. By agreement with the Council (1964), Yugoslavia also takes part in the work of some of its bodies, while the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Laos, Angola and Ethiopia have the observer status. CMEA also cooperates with Finland, Iraq, Mexico and many international organisations on the basis of special agreements.

One of the main goals in creating a new organisation was to promote the development of co-operation among nations and strengthen peace and friendship among the socialist countries. The foundation of CMEA became an important stage in the evolution of international relations of a new type on the basis of the principle of internationalism. It implied that the country possessing a bigger and more developed economy should not only refrain from subjugating weaker states but also help them to ensure speedy economic growth and bridge the gaps in the economic development between the member countries.

Irrespective of its size, natural resources and economic potential, every CMEA member has one vote in the Council's bodies and takes part only in those undertakings it finds of interest.

Since 1956 national economic development plans have been coordinated within the CMEA framework, the practice which became pivotal to CMEA activities. Adopted in December 1961, the Fundamental Principles of the International Socialist Division of Labour laid the foundation for the further expansion of cooperation among the members of the world socialist community.

Of paramount importance was the long-term comprehensive programme of the economic integration of the socialist countries worked out in 1971. By that time the socialist community had emerged as the most dynamic international economic and political force spearheading social progress and as a stronghold of peace and the security of peoples.

GUARDIAN OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

When socialism went beyond the boundaries of one country and emerged as a system, it turned into the most influential force of our day and a mighty accelerator of social progress determining the course of international development. The powerful material and technical base created in the socialist countries and their stronger defence capabilities were of decisive importance in this respect.

The Warsaw Treaty Organisation, formed in May 1955, is a key instrument of political and military cooperation of the European socialist countries and a dependable stronghold of peace in Europe and throughout the world; it firmly stands in the way of the counter-revolutionary aspirations of world imperialism and protects the socialist accomplishments of the fraternal countries. This military and political defensive alliance faithfully serves peace and is well equipped to defend peaceful life of the socialist countries.

The Warsaw Treaty was concluded in response to the policy of the Western countries, which formed an aggressive NATO bloc and included West Germany into it (despite agreements reached by the anti-Hitler coalition members during the Second World War). The Warsaw Treaty Organisation includes Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the USSR, and is open to other countries, irrespective of their social and state system. The preamble of the Warsaw Treaty records

the principles of respect for the independence and sovereignty of states and non-interference in their internal affairs. The Warsaw Treaty member states pledged to refrain from the use of force or threat to use it and, in case of an armed attack on one of them, to give the victim of aggression immediate aid by all necessary means, including the use of armed force. They also pledged to hold regular consultations on all problems of world politics and to coordinate their foreign policy activities on the world scene. The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation is the main body carrying out this coordination.

Imperialist propaganda has wasted a lot of paper and ink to portray the Warsaw Treaty as an instrument of the Soviet Union's diktat towards its allies. To lend these assertions plausibility, reference was made to the presence of Soviet troops in some Warsaw Treaty member states (the GDR, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia).

These assertions can stand no criticism. The status of Soviet troops present in each of the aforementioned countries is defined by special agreements. These troops have the task of ensuring communications for Soviet troops stationed in the GDR. The presence of the latter is explained by the presence of Western powers' troops in West Germany. The USSR repeatedly stated that Soviet troops would be withdrawn from these states' territories if NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation were disbanded. The Warsaw Treaty member countries are known to have made the corresponding proposals on several occasions

to the Western countries without getting a constructive response.

The Warsaw Treaty Organisation is a dependable guarantee of peace and socialism, and instrument of the collective defence of the socialist accomplishments of the fraternal countries and the main obstacle to interventionist plans of the imperialists.

PEOPLE, BE VIGILANT! (Conclusion)

The revolution in Russia in October 1917 showed humanity the way to social progress.

This is borne out by the fact that socialist revolution has been victorious in many countries now.

This has also been confirmed by the progress made by existing socialism, which has radically changed the entire system of human relations and is exercising a decisive influence on the course of world development.

Those who are trying to prove the fortuity of that turn in human destiny must have lost the sense of reality and engage in wishful thinking. On the other hand, sober-minded Western politicians and ideologists have for about seventy years now been forced to proceed from the fact that the October Revolution of 1917 has become an inalienable part of history. However, all of them, with rare exception, constantly seek to take social revenge and to turn the tide of history back towards counter-revolution.

We wanted to show in this little book that the permanent striving to export counter-revolution has always been associated with classes departing from the historical scene. This obvious truth is amply illustrated by history textbooks and today's

newspapers. As for modern bourgeois ideologists, they muddle reality in their writings to such an extent that one can no longer tell the truth from the lies.

In the past few decades the capitalist book markets in the West have been flooded with writings on the problems of revolution. Works by "classics" of bourgeois sociologists of revolution, such as Crane Brinton and Lyford Edwards, have been reprinted. Meisel, Daniels, Ellul, Boulding, Dunn, Marcuse, Berle, Meyer and dozens of all sorts of Johnsons, Calverts and other Western ideologists have become popular authors.

In their sociological schemes they more often than not prove that there exists the "law of Thermidor", claiming that every revolution should culminate in a counter-revolutionary "Thermidor", the month of the French republican calendar,¹ connected with the counter-revolutionary coup, which put an end to the French Revolution of 1789. For example, Crane Brinton wrote that Thermidor came into revolution-shattered societies as naturally as the ebb, as the calm after the storm, as a convalescence from the fever of revolution.

To prove the assumed futility of social revolutions in the history of society, bourgeois ideologists have evolved the so-called scheme of the revolutionary process. According to selfsame Brinton, every social revolution has the following basic and indispensable stages: a pre-revolutionary period,

¹ In force from 1793 to 1805.—*Ed.*

an explosion of violence and the overthrow of the old regime, the gradual transfer of power to ever more leftist groups, the dictatorship of "extremists"—"the extreme left"—and a Thermidor coup, signifying the return to the point of departure.

A very comforting scheme for today's Thermidorians, isn't it? After all, it makes them an indispensable component of history! Small wonder that Brinton and the like are so popular when the so-called "programme of open democracy and public diplomacy"—in fact the programme of blunt interference of unthinkable cynicism in the internal affairs of sovereign states—is declared at the official government level.

Stubborn facts that exist and develop have proved that the "law of Thermidor" has nothing to do with the course of socialist revolution; they give the lie to all the claims that they were "chance", "ephemeral" and "doomed". It was not according to Brinton that the French Revolution of 1789 should have ended in the "Thermidor", but because the broad participation of the people in the socio-political movement inevitably made the revolution more profound than the bourgeoisie heading it wanted. "Upon this excess of revolutionary activity there necessarily followed the inevitable reaction."¹ That was not the only instance when the bourgeoisie, often in alliance

¹ See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 105.

with the overthrown landlords, made efforts to brake the revolution and to restrict it to the limits of their own class interests.

In one form or another counter-revolution inevitably accompanies any revolution. By its own development, Marx wrote, revolution engenders counter-revolution.¹ This is caused by the fact that the ruling classes never voluntarily relinquish power but stubbornly resist the new system. The confrontation of revolution and counter-revolution is an objective law of class struggle.

Counter-revolution is in the long run doomed, as it contradicts the historical need for one socioeconomic formation replacing another. But it is capable of impeding social progress, causing zigzags and reversals. This raises the costs of revolutionary struggle, dooms the oppressed classes to additional privations and sometimes leads to a bloody aftermath. Counter-revolution, as a rule, entails ruthless terror.

Success in combating counter-revolution depends on the ability to take daring actions so as to eliminate immediately the seats of counter-revolution, resolutely stop all sorts of left-wing ventures and, what is most important, carry out deep-going revolutionary changes meeting the vital interests of the working people and accomplish the constructive tasks of the revolution. The history of the revolutionary movement shows that coun-

¹ See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 205.

ter-revolution can be vanquished only by expanding revolution and bringing it to its ultimate completion.

The events of the past two years unambiguously testify to the fact that as socialism strengthens and its international prestige rises, its enemies mount their attempts, making them ever more sophisticated, to eliminate socialism or weaken it now in one, now in another country. Imperialism is still bent on the forced overthrow of the socialist system, though today it resorts to more sophisticated means of subversive activity. Nowadays internal reaction inspired by imperialists uses as a smokescreen its professed desire to "improve" socialism, "to return it to its national sources", "to revive it" and "make it democratic and humane". All this in fact amounts to the selfsame attempts to uproot socialism, denigrate its achievements and curb its growing influence in the world.

Attempts by the opponents of socialism to conceal their plans and to find round-about ways of carrying out counter-revolution, as was the case, for instance, in Czechoslovakia, impel us to be more vigilant and to disclose promptly the machinations of the covert enemies of our system.

The imperialists hope to make a wide use of revisionists and opportunists of all kinds, dissidents and other malcontents in the socialist countries. For example, in the 1960s right-wing opportunists and revisionists in Czechoslovakia vehemently attacked the idea of revolutionary vigilance, seeing in it a survival of sorts of "dogmatism", which they, incidentally, ascribed to every-

thing ensuring the successful revolutionary restructuring of society in Czechoslovakia.

The more sympathy these renegates felt for our class enemies and the closer they drew together, the more allergic they became to all things Soviet, to the experience of fraternal socialist countries and to Leninism. Small wonder, therefore, that when the opportunistically-minded leaders of the Communist Party assumed guidance of the incipient counter-revolution the die-hard reactionaries in the West and all those who most viciously attacked communism showed profound sympathy for them. They admired Dubček and called this revisionist "the man of the year", reprinting his photographs, in which he looked like a martyr, in all the anti-communist publications. All of them were eager at the time to help "revive" socialism in Czechoslovakia, and the Pope even prayed that that "revival" be a success.

The document "Lessons of the Crisis in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and Society After the 13th Congress of the CPCz" (December 1970) said: "The offensive of the right-wing forces inside the country was closely linked to the ideological centres of world anti-communism. Their long-standing brainwashing and the methods of ideological subversion used by them, together with all sorts of psychological operations were designed to gradually undermine all the fundamental accomplishments of socialism in Czechoslovakia."

This is borne out by the experience gained by the Czechoslovak people in their struggle against the internal counter-revolutionary forces who

wanted to import counter-revolution, and against international imperialism, which attempted to export it into our country.

"People, be vigilant!" said Julius Fučík, a Czechoslovak national hero who was killed by the most hideous forces of world counter-revolution.

And his behest should never be forgotten.

Afterword

The historical period we live in witnesses the unprecedented confrontation of two diametrically opposite political courses—socialist and imperialist.

This is explained above all by the irreversible processes that took place on the world scene as a result of the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, the emergence of the socialist community as a powerful force of our day and the breaking up of the colonial system of imperialism. Socialism has firmly established itself on the globe, and its consistent policy of peace and the protection of the vital interests of the peoples has an ever growing positive effect on the course of world development.

On the other hand, the positions of capitalism are deteriorating. Imperialism finds itself more and more entangled in internal and inter-state antagonisms, upheavals and conflicts. Imperialist reaction obviously dreads the future, hence the sharply growing aggressiveness of the ultra-reactionary forces spearheaded by the US imperialism. Adventurism and a readiness to gamble with the vital interests of humanity for narrow and selfish ends—this is what has emerged in a particularly

bare-faced form in the policy of the more aggressive circles.

The export of counter-revolution is quite prominent in the arsenal of criminal means employed by imperialism in a bid to delay the verdict of history. The biggest portion of approximately 150 wars and armed conflicts which were unleashed by imperialism in the post-war period and which took the toll of more than 25 million people, represented attempts to export counter-revolution into other countries. For this reason the book by František Kolar, a well-known Czech journalist, is of indisputable interest.

When I was finishing reading it, I remembered President Reagan's speech at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is a rather unusual occurrence for the President to address such a session: the history of US Congress knows relatively few sessions of this type. They are held when the President has to inform the Capitol of some special foreign policy acts of his Administration rather than to discuss everyday issues. That was the case, for instance, when President F. D. Roosevelt reported to the Congress the results of the Yalta meeting of the heads of the anti-Hitler coalition states and when President Richard Nixon, seeking support for his policy of détente with the USSR, made an appeal to a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

With Reagan the situation was different. The President brought into play all his skill of a Hollywood actor to disclose to the nation a new threat

looming over it. Sounding tragic, he expatiated on the ominous danger capable to destabilise the situation in the entire region from the Panama Canal to Mexico. The hushed Congressmen were informed that a crisis situation had formed in Central America caused by a handful of professional guerrillas adhering to the philosophy which had struck roots in Nicaragua, on Cuba and in the Soviet Union. Just imagine the little and helpless country of the United States being threatened by the one of the "biggest armies"—the Nicaraguan army which, according to the President himself, has 25,000 in its ranks. A critical situation indeed arose at the US border.

Day after day the White House whips up a frenzied campaign to convince the Americans (and not only them for that matter) that the process of the so-called "East Europeanisation" is taking place in countries south of the US, characterised by the coming to power of . . . "pro-Soviet governments".

Decades ago Lenin laid bare the essence of the methods employed by reactionary bourgeois propaganda to scare the philistines with the "red menace"; he wrote: "Scare them as much as you can! This is the slogan of the whole bourgeois press. Scare them in all your might! Lie, slander, but frighten them!"¹ One of the main aims of bourgeois propaganda is to veil the essence of

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Russian Revolution and Civil War", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 1974, p. 28.

policies pursued by the imperialist bourgeoisie, in particular its invariable desire to export counter-revolution. The present publication provides numerous and convincing historical examples to this effect.

Remember how well capitalism seemed to be faring and how self-assured the powers that be looked a mere seventy or so years ago. The "concert" of great powers wielded absolute sway over the globe, which was partitioned by them at their free will into their colonies. The working people toiled in submission 12 or 14 hours a day, their starved children and wives getting foodstuffs of dubious quality in shops run by their masters. Hundreds of millions of blacks, Asiatics and other coloureds were reduced to an inhuman condition. When Uncle Sam wanted to "treat" himself to Mexico, he grabbed half of the country, proclaiming it his own territory under the name of Texas. It was enough for the British or the Spanish king to learn of lands rich not only in spices but also in slaves and gold, and flags were hoisted over ships and entire continents subjected to colonialists. "Bring me gold," Spanish kings told the conquistadores setting out on their journeys. "Bring me gold by fair means or foul." And they obtained it by all means! The indigenous population was mercilessly lashed and put in stocks, and it seemed that the power of capital would reign forever, bolstered by violence and oppression.

Then all of a sudden the world was shaken by the October Revolution of 1917! The blacks, the muzhiks, the Asiatics said they, too, were human

beings and, what was more, wanted to be the masters of their own destinies. The oppressors who had for centuries been used to trampling upon other peoples, found themselves confronted with a heretofore unknown problem of how to preserve the world of violence and slavery, the world that was going to pieces. It was then that the essence of bourgeois civilisation and the justice of the bourgeois system came to light.

In his time Marx wrote: "The civilisation and justice of bourgeois order comes out in its lurid light whenever the slaves and drudges of that order rise against their masters. Then this civilisation and justice stand forth as undisguised savagery and lawless-revenge."¹

The export of counter-revolution has become a tool of the capitalist civilisation. Those who encourage and advocate this criminal policy claim that the "minority" encroaches upon the most "sacred" pillar of this world—private property, and it is, of course, the Communists who "incite" the "thieves". Therefore, "eternal and sacred" private property can only be saved by annihilating those "instigators". This is how the policy of "crusades" against the peoples striving to secure their right to life came into being. The latest of such "crusades" was proclaimed by President Reagan against socialism and all freedom-loving and progressive forces.

¹ Karl Marx, "The Civil War in France". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, p. 235.

Needless to say, there is not a grain of truth in all the arguments of the exporters of counter-revolution.

The communist movement has never advocated the export of revolution. The founders of the revolutionary theory denounced any "pushing" of revolutions, including with the help of arms, and showed the untenability of all talk about the possibility to "bring revolution on the bayonets" to some nation. Lenin is known to have been sharply critical of the theory of "pushing" revolutions, stressing that "such a 'theory' would be completely at variance with Marxism..."¹ Both Marx and Lenin believed that revolutions arose only wherever and whenever the majority of the population—the working people—came to realise that they could no longer live as they had lived before.

This is precisely what is happening now in Latin America, Southern Africa and Asia—wherever people are waging anti-imperialist liberation struggle against their enslavers and oppressors.

The Washington rulers publicly allege that the peoples fighting for freedom pose "threat to the security of the United States", but they never mention that during the US domination of Nicaragua, which had lasted for more than a century, more than 100,000 citizens of that country perished. They prefer to disregard the fact that only at the last stage of the struggle against the murderous Somoza dictatorship 45,000 Nicaraguans were

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Strange and Monstrous", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1965, pp. 71-72.

killed and 150,000 wounded, 250,000 were left homeless and the damage suffered by the nation amounted to billions of dollars. These figures are quite eloquent and, among other things, give people an idea of the just cause of the Nicaraguan patriots, who have thrown out Washington's henchman Somoza and who continue heroically to defend every inch of their land from gangs of hirelings.

But the Washington rulers do not renounce their plans to restore the old regime in Nicaragua. With this aim in view the exporters of counter-revolution have brought all possible means into play, such as the arming, training and sending into the country thousand-strong Somoza gangs, economic blockade and disruption of the Nicaraguan economy.

The US Administration has earmarked over 100 million dollars to finance terrorist activities against Nicaragua. More than 8,000 Nicaraguans, for the most part civilians, had suffered at the hands of their mercenaries by late 1984, with more than 2,700 killed (about 130 of them children). Several thousands of people living in the border regions had been kidnapped.

By early 1985 Nicaragua suffered a damage to the tune of 1.000 million dollars after Washington had stopped credits and pressurised international financial organisations into denying it all other types of aid. Nicaragua's foreign debt grew to 4.350 million dollars and the country has to pay 872 million dollars in servicing its foreign debts. The war imposed on that small country is

devouring a lion's share of its finances: it has to spend 40 per cent of its national budget on defence.

In alliance with the reactionary elements in other NATO countries the US ruling elite hopes that the arms race, military-political confrontation with the socialist world and the use of force against the national liberation movement will enable it to implement its far-reaching plans to restore its positions in the world, in particular by exporting counter-revolution. It is American imperialism that is the main exporter of counter-revolution in our day.

At the same time the political mentality of the current US Administration is characterised by excessive emphasis on allegedly world-wide interests and the "responsibility" of the United States, called upon to camouflage the hegemonistic aspirations of US monopoly capital with respect to the rest of the world. This process is gathering momentum with every passing year.

The Reagan Administration did everything to free the country from the so-called Vietnam syndrome, that is, the reluctance of common Americans to take part in bloody invasions of other countries after socialist Vietnam had dealt the biggest capitalist state of today a serious blow. Throughout these years of persistent attempts to get rid of the Vietnam syndrome a continuous process was under way of "wiping" out from the American people's memory the horrors of the Vietnam war and of preparing the Americans psychologically for new wars. *Time* magazine wrote that through-

out that period the US brass hats mounted a broad propaganda campaign to extol the army. It goes on to say that they did everything to "gloss the white knight". But, as the proverb has it, you cannot wash charcoal white—the repulsive image of the Pentagon brass is notorious in many regions of the globe and can hardly be whitewashed.

The American press provides ample illustrations to the effect. The *US News and World Report* asked its experts to carry out a survey to establish on how many occasions in the past decades the Pentagon used its armed force directly or indirectly to impose upon other countries the terms and order to Washington's liking. The findings were as follows: "On no fewer than 262 occasions since World War II, US armed forces have been used to pursue foreign-policy aims."¹ American troops, planes, and ships appeared in almost every corner of the world—in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America. They were used to overthrow democratic governments, to suppress national liberation movement, to launch bloody aggressions and to bring dictators and reactionary juntas to power. The bloody intervention against the Vietnamese people, the overthrow of the Popular Unity government in Chile, the actual war against the Nicaraguan people, direct interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador, the undeclared war against Afghanistan, Washington's all-out backing of the monstrous Israeli crimes against the Arabs, and its direct in-

¹ *US News and World Report*, April 11, 1983, p. 70.

volvement into this aggression are but a few links of this criminal policy.

Of course, the author could not deal with all the cases of the export of counter-revolution by US imperialism, nor was it his aim to do so. However, what he described stands out as a wrathful charge against the reactionary forces, which have always tried and continue trying to stifle the revolutionary upsurge of the masses, to destroy the new progressive regime and to preclude encroachments upon the "sacred mainstay" of exploiter society.

The United States of America is now living through a genuine political tragedy. The reason is not only the fact that the master of the White House is a man whose political career, to quote the West German newspaper *Frankfurter Rundschau*, is connected with "emotionally indiscriminate anti-communism of the times of the wild outburst of McCarthyism", nor that provincials from California with little understanding of world politics have come to the White House together with him. This tragedy stems from the fact that the more reactionary elements of the American bourgeoisie have got the upper hand in the country and undertaken to eliminate international detente. In fact the US is ruled by the "party of war preparations" intent on unleashing a world nuclear conflict . . .

The key posts in higher places in the US were seized by the leaders of the Californian financial oligarchy, the "manufacturers of death", greedy for other people's wealth. California and the neigh-

bouring states are now virtually studded with enterprises producing instruments of death. Corporations such as Lockheed Aircraft, Boeing Co., and Rockwell International are well-known. Of late, however, the world press has increasingly been mentioning the Bechtel corporation. . . .

The latter was previously known as the world's biggest construction company building, among other things, a gas pipeline in the Middle East. Only few know, however, that Bechtel specialises in huge power plants producing plutonium and works putting out nuclear warheads and missiles.

On one occasion *Miami News* carried a photograph showing the White House pediment decorated with an advertisement board bearing the words "Bechtel Branch". I think there is a point here. After all US Secretary of State George Shultz had for eight years been president of that corporation before appearing in the Reagan Administration. US Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger was among the directors of the corporation and its legal adviser and received \$ 300,000 as separation payment from it in 1981. Kenneth Davis, deputy secretary in the Department of Energy, was also the company's one-time boss. Bechtel headquarters also employed Philip Habib, who is entrusted to carry out the most "delicate" operations in the Middle East in the interests of Washington and Tel Aviv. American newspapers point out that scarce information on Bechtel gave birth to rumours about its close ties with the CIA. These rumours are corroborated by the fact that John McCone, a former CIA director, is one of

the corporation's managers, while another former CIA director, Richard Helms, is at present the corporation's adviser. Washington analyst James Reston once joked that it was surprising that the President had not as yet simply transferred all the muddle called US foreign policy to the Bechtel corporation. That would at least have saved the Administration the trouble of running things.

Another name which regularly appears in the American press is that of Helionetix, a military-industrial corporation whose board of directors is also in California. It was in the offices of that corporation that a "star wars" plan made public by Reagan in 1983 was first worked out. Among those who masterminded that hideous plan was Edward Teller, the father of H-bomb and a close friend of the Reagan family. Helionetix specialises not only in the production of Pershing-2 missiles, which Washington thrusts upon Western Europe, but also laser weapons to be used in space... Small wonder, therefore, that "star wars" now feature prominently in the list of priorities of the Reagan Administration.

The militarisation of economic life and political mentality is an indispensable condition in pursuing the imperialist policy of the export of counter-revolution. According to *Inquiry*, the Reagan Administration proceeds from the prospect of "new Vietnams", that is to say, new military interventions.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are regarded in Washington as the main obstacle to implementing interventionist plans.

Therefore, world imperialist reaction, with the US in the lead, directs its most vile schemes against the socialist community.

The more failures their anti-socialist aspirations meet, the more wily and sophisticated their tactics becomes, as is graphically shown in this book. For instance, the methods employed by counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia in 1968 were by far subtler than those used in Hungary in 1956. And they have become even more up-to-date and dangerous during the attempt to undermine the socialist system in Poland in 1980-1981.

The military-political subversion in Poland had long been in the making, and the most jesuitical measures were brought into play. The entire system of anti-socialist activities that would ensure the export of counter-revolution was scrupulously analysed, including the use of hostile propaganda, especially radio propaganda, the involvement of the Catholic Church, the disintegration of the workers', above all trade union, movement, attempts to ruin the Polish United Workers' Party, the exploitation of the grave mistakes made by the previous Polish leadership, and the deliberate disorganisation of the country's economy. The whipping up of frenzied nationalism, anti-Sovietism and anti-communism was aimed at eroding the foundations of socialism in Poland, discrediting socialism and disaffecting the Poles and other peoples with it. At the same time, use was made of all sorts of foreign policy and diplomatic means up to US government officials' direct participation in acts of subversion against the socialist sys-

tem in Poland. Here, a process of dismantling post-war Europe was to start, subsequently spreading to the rest of the present-day world. Availing itself of the events in Poland, international reaction raised the issue of revising the established borders and renouncing the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. Hopes were pinned on turning Poland into a detonator of a new war in Europe.

František Kolar cited the secret plan presented by Zbigniew Brzezinski to President Carter on March 17, 1978. I'd like to turn back to that document which sheds light on the far-reaching plans of US and world imperialist reaction. Its author writes, for example, that the post-war organisation of Europe and international tensions belong merely to a transitional stage, and that it is now time for a more active policy to deepen the process of changes in the communist world. Analysis of the situation in individual countries, the document goes on to say, makes it possible to draw the conclusion that Poland is the most vulnerable link among the East European countries . . . , the link on which the US and its allies should focus their attention. Everything the West has at its disposal should be used to establish pro-Western policy and pro-Western economic orientation in Poland. Should the open-strike policy fail, the aforementioned plan proposes a different tactic—that of the “creeping counter-revolution”.

Struggle for socialist Poland became extremely acute as the danger heightened. It is significant that the Polish events have shown that socialism is stronger than imperialism and can thwart the

most vicious plans for the export of counter-revolution.

Imperialism has always been and continues to be a perfidious predator capable of all crimes and ventures in its striving to turn the tide of history. But the world has long changed. New laws operate in today's world and they are increasingly shaped by world socialism and the workers', communist and national liberation movements. The alignment of forces is inexorably changing to the disadvantage of imperialism and its hirelings.

It should always be kept in mind, however, that this process does not occur automatically: every step forward is made in the revolutionary confrontation with the black forces of counter-revolution, including those who want to export it.

Washington's official declaration of its programme of psychological warfare, alias the "programme of democracy and public diplomacy" in February 1983 attests to the fact that attempts at such export never stop and, on the contrary, become ever more flagrant and trample underfoot all norms of international relations.

The authors of the programme did their utmost to give it a semblance of decency, dwelling at length on the need to "advocate the principles of democracy", a free "exchange of ideas and information", and so on. A closer acquaintance with the programme, however, makes it absolutely clear that this "democracy" and "information" are called to serve the US Administration's aggressive military policy.

One of the proclaimed tasks is "to counter non-

democratic forces". It is common knowledge, however, that Washington refers the cliché to those who oppose the adventurist policy of American "hawks" and who champion peace and the peoples' freedom.

The formulated aim is to coordinate the "interagency effort to support the growth of democracy and democratic institutions abroad". But the Voice of America and other radio stations of that type make it abundantly clear that reference is made here to the destabilisation of the Soviet Union and its allies by setting the peoples of these countries off against their leaders.

The document mentions the need to "convey a more accurate picture of the character and values of the United States". It is obviously a fresh attempt to conceal the true essence of Washington's aggressive foreign policy.

The task is set to train leadership for foreign countries, in other words, people who would faithfully serve the needs of US monopoly capital. Perhaps, it is a new channel of infiltrating other countries? Plenty of them have already existed for quite a while, such as "giving aid", including financial, to pro-American political parties in foreign countries, and "subsidising" their media, trade union, religious and other organisations "inclined" to act in line with Washington's needs.

The programme is just as frankly directed against the nations fighting for their national independence and social progress. What is meant here, in particular, is the training of young people from developing countries in American education-

al establishments so that they might be later on used in running their countries. A broader exchange of students is also designed to facilitate the propaganda of the American way of life. The makers of the programme in fact aim at setting up the "fifth column", which is a tested means of exporting counter-revolution.

To implement these vile schemes the general mobilisation has been held of the "media, universities, business, legal and judicial systems, religion, community action, etc.". This mobilisation is clearly needed for interventionist ends, for imposing the will and interests of US monopoly capital on other nations and countries. They intend "to pipe all hands on deck" in order to launch a "crusade" against the revolutionary development of the world today and to export counter-revolution.

Resorting to the cover of "democracy and public diplomacy", the American Administration is looking for new avenues to infringe upon the rights of the people and impose its own will and ideas on them. It openly wants to turn ideological struggle with the socialist world and the nations fighting for their freedom and independence into psychological warfare. In addition to the old methods of primarily "secret war" against the governments which Washington finds undesirable, hopes are now pinned on the legal "fifth column", and a ramified network of influencing other countries and nations is in the making.

The socialist countries and all the freedom-loving forces urge that people stay vigilant in the

face of new subversions by their class enemies.

The world socialist system is a decisive factor of social progress. The community of socialist states constitutes a new type of international relations based on the principles of socialist internationalism—ideological unity, the common goals, comradely mutual assistance and full respect for the interests, national features and traditions of each country. The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance largely contributes to the socialist countries' growing might and social progress by implementing comprehensive programmes of socialist economic integration. The community is safely protected by the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

The socialist world is firmly withstanding the mounting attacks by imperialist reaction. Our class enemies are, unfortunately, still capable of doing us at times tangible harm. But they are unable to seriously impede our progress and even less so to push world socialism back. The flow of new life and the historic advance of socialism are gathering momentum, confidently sweeping away all the obstacles in their way.

The Communists and the entire population of the socialist countries aim not only at precluding wars. They want to improve radically international relations and to develop and consolidate them on the basis of goodwill. They work persistently to ensure respect for the sovereign rights of states and nations and the strict observance of the principles of international law, which imperialism ever more frequently tries to discard and trample upon.

The Communists are firmly convinced that the future belongs to socialism. Such is the objective course of history. But this does not mean that Communists engage in the export of revolution. This practice would run counter to communist world outlook and is in fact unfeasible.

The Marxist-Leninists are in principle against the export of revolution and at the same time resolutely oppose the export of counter-revolution.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries resolutely denounce interference in the affairs of other states and the violation of their sovereignty. Socialism is the most consistent advocate of a healthy basis for international relations, detente and peace, and defender of the interests of every nation and entire humanity. The socialist countries have no desire to impose their system on anybody. Today, as ever they consider it inadmissible and even criminal to attempt the export of counter-revolution in any form. Respect for the will of the peoples and for their desire to settle their domestic matters on their own, without any interference from without, and to carry out revolutionary transformations in their society would largely promote lasting peace on earth.

VITALY KORIONOV,
Pravda political observer.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.



**František
Kolar**

František Kolar (1919-1984), a well-known Czech journalist, was active in the anti-fascist Resistance movement during the Second World War. In the post-war period he was a party functionary, then editor-in-chief of the weeklies Nova Svoboda and Tvorba and assistant editor-in-chief of Rudé Právo, the central organ of the C.P.Cz. In the last years of his life he was editor-in-chief of the Praha-Moskva magazine and assistant professor of journalism at Charles University in Prague. His publications include Nationalisation of Industry and the Banking System (1945), No Return to Capitalism (1948), Zionism and Anti-Semitism (1970), and Truth About Soviet Reality and Anti-Soviet Lies (1971). His last book, Export of Counter-Revolution: Past and Present, was published in Prague in 1983 and also put out in Russian in Moscow in 1984.

THE EXPORT OF COUNTER- REVOLUTION: PAST AND PRESENT